

Mediaeval Studies

Volume 52
1990



Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies

The Fellows of the Pontifical Institute constitute
the Editorial Board of *Mediaeval Studies*.

Editorial Committee, 1988-89

Walter H. Principe, Chair

Stephen D. Dumont

Roger E. Reynolds

Edward D. English, Executive Editor

Editorial Committee, 1989-90

James K. Farge, Chair

Deborah L. Black

Ron B. Thomson

Roger E. Reynolds

Edward D. English, Executive Editor

Nancy L. McElwee, Assistant to the Executive Editor

© 1990 by

Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies
59 Queen's Park Crescent East
Toronto, Ontario
Canada M5S 2C4

This volume has been published with aid from
a grant from the Social Sciences
and Humanities Research Council of Canada.

ISBN 0-88844-654-3
ISSN 0076-5872

Printed by
UNIVERSA-WETTEREN-BELGIUM

CONTENTS

George Bernard Cardinal Flahiff, C.B.S. (1905-1989)	<i>Michael M. Sheehan</i>	v
Ashley Crandell Amos (1951-1989)	<i>Laurence K. Shook</i>	ix

TEXTS

Accessus ad Alexandrum: The <i>Prefatio</i> to the <i>Postilla in Iohannis Euangelium</i> of Alexander of Hales (1186?-1245)	<i>Abigail Ann Young</i>	1
The <i>Meditationes</i> of Alexander of Ashby: An Edition	<i>Thomas H. Bestul</i>	24

ARTICLES

Diverse Orderings of Dionysius's <i>Triplex via</i> by St. Thomas Aquinas	<i>Michael B. Ewbank</i>	82
The Liturgy of the Liberation of Jerusalem	<i>Amnon Linder</i>	110
Paraphrase Editions of Latin Mathematical Texts: <i>De figuris ysoperi-</i> <i>metris</i>	<i>Wilbur R. Knorr</i>	132
'The King Taught Us the Lesson': Benedictine Support for Henry v's Suppression of the Lollards	<i>Patrick J. Horner</i>	190
Medieval Latin Poetic Anthologies (VI): The Cotton anthology of Henry of Avranches (B.L. Cotton Vespasian D.v., fols. 151-184)	<i>Peter Binkley</i>	221
The Lambeth Palace Library Manuscript Account of Henry vi's 1432 London Entry	<i>Richard H. Osberg</i>	255
<i>Miscellanea beneventana</i> (VI)		
1. A Fragment of a Liturgical Roll at Montecassino (Compactiones XVI)	<i>Richard F. Gyug</i>	268
2. The South-Italian Canon Law <i>Collection in Five Books</i> and Its Derivatives: New Evidence on Its Origins, Diffusion, and Use	<i>Roger E. Reynolds</i>	278
3. The Greek Liturgy of St. John Chrysostum in Beneventan Script: An Early Manuscript Fragment	<i>Roger E. Reynolds</i>	296



GEORGE BERNARD CARDINAL FLAHIFF, C.S.B. (1905-1989)

Michael M. Sheehan, C.S.B.

George Bernard, Cardinal Flahiff, retired archbishop of Winnipeg and former professor of the Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, died 22 August 1989 at St. Michael's Hospital, Toronto. He was in his eighty-fourth year.

George Flahiff was born on 26 October 1905 in Paris, Ontario. After attending primary and secondary school there, he completed his university-entrance studies at St. Jerome's College, Kitchener. He then entered St. Michael's College in the University of Toronto, from which he graduated with an honours B.A. in English and History in 1926. That autumn he entered the novitiate of the Basilian Fathers, and four years later he was ordained to the priesthood. In the autumn of 1930 he joined the first group of young Basilians sent to European universities for preparation as teachers in the Institute of Mediaeval Studies, which had been founded under the direction of Étienne Gilson the year before. He studied first at the University of Strasbourg, then moved to Paris, where he enrolled in L'École des Chartes. In 1935 he presented his thesis, 'Le bref royal de prohibition aux cours d'Église en Angleterre (1187-1286)', and received the Diplôme Archiviste-Paléographe.

In the autumn of 1935, George Flahiff began lecturing at the Institute of Mediaeval Studies, a task that he would continue for the next twenty years. He was also cross-appointed to the Department of History in the School of Graduate Studies of the University of Toronto. Father Flahiff lectured on the history of institutions and on the history of the art and architecture of medieval Europe. In his research and direction of theses, he gave special attention to the relationship between civil and ecclesiastical institutions. Contemporary developments in liturgy and religious art and architecture were also of interest to him: he was a member of the Liturgical Arts Association of New York, contributed to its journal, *Liturgical Arts*, and was consultant on the building and decoration of a number of contemporary churches and chapels. In academic life he proved to be singularly adept as a counsellor of students, a role that was enhanced in 1943, when he became Secretary of the Institute, a post that he would hold until 1954. In that year he was elected Superior General of the Basilian Fathers, and the academic part of his career was sharply curtailed.

In his new office Father Flahiff presided over the rapid growth of the Basilian Fathers, who opened new houses in Canada, France, Mexico and the United States. He was also concerned with religious life in general, assisting in the foundation of the Canadian Religious Conference, of which he was President 1958-61. He had been re-elected Superior General of his Congregation in 1960, but was to hold the office for only a few months: in March, 1961, he was appointed Archbishop of Winnipeg.

Archbishop Flahiff was consecrated in Toronto on 31 May 1961 and installed in his see on 26 June. In addition to the pastoral and administrative demands of a large diocese, the new prelate was required to give much of his life to activity beyond Winnipeg. In 1963 he began a two-year term as President of the National Conference of Catholic Bishops of Canada. During the Second Vatican Council, he was elected to the Conciliar Commission on Religious. Later, Pope Paul VI appointed him to continue as a member of the post-conciliar Commission for Religious and, beginning in 1967, to the Congregation for Religious and Secular Institutes. Archbishop Flahiff also served on the Congregation for Catholic Education. He was chosen to represent the Canadian hierarchy at the first Synod of Bishops, held in Rome in 1967, and at the synod of 1971. The latter was concerned with the ministerial priesthood and it was there, in an important intervention, that he recommended the establishment of a commission to examine the role of the laity, including women, in all aspects of the life of the Church. By that time Archbishop Flahiff had been appointed to the College of Cardinals. The announcement was made in March 1969 and he was consecrated Cardinal Priest, with Santa Maria della Salute a Primavalle as his titular church, in the consistory of 28 April. Cardinal Flahiff was a member of the conclaves of 1978 that elected Pope John Paul I and Pope John Paul II.

After retiring from his see in 1982, Cardinal Flahiff returned to St. Michael's College, Toronto, where he lived in comparatively good health until early 1989, when he moved to the Basilian Fathers Residence. There he remained until he was hospitalized a few days before his death.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. 'May-Medals at St. Michael's', *The Basilian* 4 (1938) 117.
2. 'Ralph Niger: An Introduction to His Life and Works', *Mediaeval Studies* 2 (1940) 104-126.
3. Review of *Mediaeval Studies in Memory of A. Kingsley Porter*, ed. Wilhelm R. W. Koehler, *Liturgical Arts* 9 (1940-41) 15-17.
4. 'The Use of Prohibitions by Clerics against Ecclesiastical Courts in England', *Mediaeval Studies* 3 (1941) 101-116.
5. 'A Catholic Looks at History', *The Catholic Historical Review* 27 (1941-42) 1-15.

6. 'Ecclesiastical Censorship of Books in the Twelfth Century', *Mediaeval Studies* 4 (1942) 1-22.
7. 'The Writ of Prohibition to Court Christian in the Thirteenth Century', *Mediaeval Studies* 6 (1944) 261-313; 7 (1945) 229-90.
8. 'Deus Non Vult: A Critic of the Third Crusade', *Mediaeval Studies* 9 (1947) 162-88.
9. 'The Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies at Toronto', *Speculum* 24 (1949) 251-55.
10. *Sermon Preached by Rev. G. B. Flahiff, C.S.B., of the Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, at the Consecration of the Main Altar of Holy Rosary Church, Toronto, Ontario, Sunday February the Twenty-sixth, Nineteen Hundred and Fifty* (Toronto, 1950).
11. Review of Joan Evans, *Art in Mediaeval France 987-1498. A Study in Patronage, Liturgical Arts* 19 (1950-51) 114-16.
12. Review of Joan Evans, *Cluniac Art of the Romanesque Period, Liturgical Arts* 20 (1951-52) 95-96.
13. Review of Emerson H. Swift, *Roman Sources of Christian Art, Liturgical Arts* 20 (1951-52) 127-28.
14. 'Commentaries on a Way of the Cross', *Liturgical Arts* 20 (1951-52) 112, 116-17, 121-22.
15. 'Can Modern Art be Christian?', *The Catholic Art Quarterly* 16 (1952) 7-15.
16. 'The Past has a Future' in *Man Alive* (Radio League of St. Michael, Toronto, 1952), pp. 1-4.
17. *Can Art be Christian?* (Toronto, 1952).
18. Review of Francis J. Tschan, *St. Bernard of Hildesheim, Pt. 2: His Works of Art. Pt. 3: Album* in *Liturgical Arts* 21 (1952-53) 25-26.
19. Review of C.W. Previté-Orton, *The Shorter Cambridge Medieval History, Liturgical Arts* 21 (1952-53) 134-35.
20. 'Social Aspect of the Supernatural Life' (Paper Read at the First Michaelmas Conference, 20 September 1953 [Toronto, 1953]), pp. 50-73.
21. Review of D. Talbot Rice, *English Art, 871-1100, Liturgical Arts* 22 (1953-54) 92-93.
22. 'Twelfth Century Critics and Humanists', *The Canadian Historian Association/La Société historique du Canada, Report* (1954) 61-68.
23. 'Introduction' to *First Basilian Meeting to Discuss Vocations, 29 December 1955* (Proceedings; Toronto, 1955), pp. 1-2.
24. 'Introduction' to *Second Basilian Meeting to Discuss Vocations, 29 December 1956: The Signs of a Priestly Vocation* (Proceedings; Toronto, 1956), pp. 1-3.
25. 'Homily' in *People's Participation and Holy Week: 17th North American Liturgical Week, London, Canada, August 20-23, 1956* (Elsberry, Mo., 1957), pp. 27-35.
26. 'Guidance. Its Nature, Purpose, and Area of Coverage', *The Basilian Teacher* 3 (1958-59) 84-89.
27. 'Materialism and Education', *The Basilian Teacher* 4 (1959-60) 123-32.
28. 'Foreword' to *Donum Dei: A Publication of the Canadian Religious Conference. Religious Poverty in the Modern World* (Ottawa, 1960), p. 5.
29. 'Salvation of the Nations' in *Thy Kingdom Come: Christian Hope in the Modern World. Twenty-third North American Liturgical Week, Seattle, Washington, August 20-23, 1962* (Washington, D.C., 1963), pp. 62-71.

30. *Responsibilities in Education: The Constants and the Variants* (Address Delivered at the Nineteenth Annual Catholic Education Conference, Toronto, 24 April 1963; Toronto, 1963).
31. 'Letters on Vatican II', *The Basilian Newsletter* (15 November 1962, 25 October 1963, 12 November 1964).
32. 'Man's Disorder and God's Design' in *Council Speeches of Vatican II*, ed. H. Küng, Y. Congar, and D. O'Hanlon (London, 1964), pp. 122-23.
33. 'Les orientations de l'Église enseignante' in *Donum Dei: Cahiers de la Conférence religieuse canadienne. Dialogues des religieux avec le monde. Assemblée générale de 1964* (Ottawa, 1965), pp. 119-39; 'The Paths of the Church' in *Donum Dei: A Publication of the Canadian Religious Conference. Religious and Dialogue with the World. Grand Assembly of 1964* (Ottawa, 1965), pp. 123-42.
34. 'Foreword' to *The Condition of Man* (Montréal, 1965), p. iii.
35. 'The Church is for the World', *Sister Formation Bulletin* 17 no. 5 (Fall, 1971) 3-6, 20.
36. 'Intervention', *IDOC International* (North American Edition) 38 (1971) 39-43.
37. 'Women in the Ministry', *IDOC International* (North American Edition) 38 (1971) 52-55.
38. 'Cardinal Flahiff on Ministry of Women (Oct. 11, 1971)', *Catholic Mind* 70 (1972) 31-33.
39. 'Cardinal Flahiff on Christian Formation for Justice (Oct. 21, 1971)', *Catholic Mind* 70 (1972) 52-54.
40. 'Synodal Observations', *The Way. Supplement* 17 (1972) 107-110.

During his years as archbishop of Winnipeg, Cardinal Flahiff issued about one hundred pastoral letters on a variety of themes, notably those touching liturgy, ecumenism, abortion, education and the implementation of the directives of II Vatican Council.



ASHLEY CRANDELL AMOS (1951-1989)

Laurence Kennedy Shook, C.S.B.

Ashley Crandell Amos was born in New York City, graduated Phi Beta Kappa in 1972 from Stanford University and became a graduate student in English Language under Professor Fred C. Robinson at Yale University, where she twice won the distinguished Noah Webster Prize for the best essay on the English Language. During 1975-1976, she held the prestigious Whiting Fellowship as Yale's best graduate student in English. Ashley's doctoral dissertation, titled 'The Linguistic Means of Determining the Dates of Old English Literary Texts', was completed in 1976 and published by the Medieval Academy of America in 1980.

During 1976, her final year of graduate studies, Ashley married Bruce Amos and moved to Toronto. On the recommendation of John Leyerle, she had been offered a Junior Fellowship and an Instructorship in Vernacular Literatures at the Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies and a publishing assignment with the Centre for Medieval Studies under Angus Cameron, editor-in-chief of Toronto's *Dictionary of Old English*, a project already under way since 1970. Throughout her career, Ashley was to hold this two-fold appointment.

When Ashley joined the Dictionary team, Cameron and his colleagues had already produced a complete list of Old English texts, had collected copies and microfilms of most editions and of all manuscripts of texts, and had begun putting these into machine-readable form. Ashley's first assignment on the project consisted of correcting and concurring the corpus of texts, producing dictionary slips from concordances, preparing word-studies of Old-English words, indexing these studies and preparing a master microfiche concordance to the Old-English corpus. By 1980, the Dictionary team had drawn up its list for A-E, L and P, and was composing entries. It was at this stage that Ashley visited the *Dictionary of the Older Scottish Tongue* and became highly knowledgeable in the various appropriate methods of entry-writing.

By 1983, reporting for the Committee, Ashley was able to announce in the *Old English Newsletter* the publication of *Old English Word Studies: A Preliminary Author and Word Index*, by Angus Cameron, Allison Kingsmill and Ashley Crandell Amos, volume 8 in the Toronto Old-English Series edited by her colleague Roberta Frank. Ashley likewise assisted John Leyerle in his important

work of obtaining grants in aid of research and specialized editorial grants over several years, both independently and through the President's Committee of the University of Toronto.

In January 1983, when Angus Cameron had already become seriously ill, Ashley was named his Co-Editor of the Dictionary Project. Following Angus' death, she was sole editor until 1985, when Antonette diPaolo Healey, her colleague and close friend, became her Co-Editor. Together with other dedicated members of the Dictionary team they have set the highest standards of excellence for the project.

Complementing Ashley's Dictionary work were her lecture and seminar assignments within the general programme of the Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, where she was Professor of Early Vernacular Languages and Literatures. Ashley regularly provided the Institute's introductory course in this area as well as a specialized series of seminars.

The death of Ashley Crandell Amos on 7 June 1989 is a deep personal and institutional loss for both the Centre for Medieval Studies and the Institute. Ashley is sadly missed and deeply loved by her colleagues, all of whom were her close friends.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. with Angus Cameron, 'The Dictionary of Old English: A Turning Point' in *English Studies* 59 (1978) 289-94.
2. 'The Lexical Treatment of the Function Words in the Dictionary of Old English' in *Papers of the Dictionary Society of North America* 1979, ed. William J. Cameron (London, Ont., 1979), pp. 173-79.
3. 'Dictionary of Old English: 1978 Progress Report', *Old English Newsletter* 12 (1979) 13-15.
4. *Linguistic Means of Determining the Dates of Old English Literary Texts* (Medieval Academy Books 90; Cambridge, Mass., 1980).
5. 'Dictionary of Old English: 1979 Progress Report', *Old English Newsletter* 13 (1980) 21-22.
6. with Angus Cameron and Gregory Waite, with the assistance of Sharon Butler and Antonette diPaolo Healey, 'A Reconsideration of the Language of *Beowulf*' in *The Dating of Beowulf*, ed. Colin Chase (Toronto Old English Series 6; Toronto, 1981), pp. 33-75.
7. 'Dictionary of Old English: 1980 Progress Report', *Old English Newsletter* 14 (1981) 11-12.
8. 'Dictionary of Old English: 1981 Progress Report', *Old English Newsletter* 15 (1982) 12-14.
9. *Old English Word Studies: A Preliminary Author and Word Index*, with Angus Cameron and Allison Kingsmill (Toronto Old English Series 8; Toronto, 1983).
10. 'Dictionary of Old English: 1982 Progress Report', *Old English Newsletter* 16 (1983) 18-19.

11. 'Dictionary of Old English: 1983 Progress Report', *Old English Newsletter* 17 (1984) 12-13.
12. with Antonette diPaolo Healey, 'The Dictionary of Old English: The Letter "D"' in *Problems of Old English Lexicography: Studies in Memory of Angus Cameron*, ed. Alfred Bammesberger (Eichstatter Beitrage 15; Regensburg, 1985), pp. 13-38.
13. *The Dictionary of Old English: D*, with Angus Cameron, Antonette diPaolo Healey, Sharon Butler, Joan Holland, David McDougall, and Ian McDougall (Toronto, 1986).
14. *The Dictionary of Old English: C*, with Antonette diPaolo Healey, Joan Holland, David McDougall, Ian McDougall, Nancy Porter, and Pauline Thompson (Toronto, 1988).
15. 'Computers and Lexicography: *The Dictionary of Old English*' in *Editing, Publishing, and Computer Technology*, ed. Sharon Butler and William P. Stoneman (New York, 1988), pp. 45-64.
16. 'Old English Words for *Old*' in *Aging and the Aged in Medieval Europe: Selected Papers from the Annual Conference of the Centre for Medieval Studies, University of Toronto, Held 25-26 February and 11-12 November 1983* (Papers in Mediaeval Studies 11; Toronto, 1990), pp. 95-106.

ACCESSUS AD ALEXANDRUM:
THE *PRAEFATIO* TO THE
POSTILLA IN IOHANNIS EUANGELIUM
OF ALEXANDER OF HALES (1186?-1245)

Abigail Ann Young

IN recent decades increased attention has been paid by modern students of mediaeval theology to the systematic theology and Christology of the authentic works of Alexander of Hales, the first Franciscan master in theology at the University of Paris. However, despite the centrality of the Bible in the mediaeval theology curriculum, as well as in mediaeval thought in general, not one of Alexander's lengthy lecture series (*postillae* or postills) on biblical books has as yet been edited (see below, p. 4). This is in part owing to their very length, but also in part to an apparent bias toward philosophical and systematic studies among modern students of mediaeval thought. While scriptural commentaries are read by some for doctrinal development, few mediaeval biblical commentaries have been analyzed as exegetical works, and fewer still have received modern editions. (The exceptions here are the commentaries of famous theologians, such as Thomas or Bonaventure, which have been edited as part of *Opera omnia*.) An edition of the *praefatio* to the *postilla* (as well as a brief study of its text) is presented here as the first step toward an edition of the whole text. This *praefatio*, which represents the opening lecture of the course on John, sets out succinctly Alexander's views on the theme and contents of that gospel, touches upon what we should now call the Synoptic problem, and gives an outline of the course. It thus can stand independently of the rest of the *postilla* while casting light upon the work as a whole and upon Alexander as a exegete.

I. ALEXANDER'S LIFE AND WORKS

Alexander of Hales was born in England, of wealthy but not noble parents, most probably in the village of Hales (now the town of Hales Owen) in Shropshire.¹ The

¹ This discussion of Alexander's life is based on the Prolegomenon to the Quaracchi edition of the *Glossa in quatuor libros sententiarum Petri Lombardi*, 4 vols., (Quaracchi, 1951-57), 1.7*-75*. Unless otherwise noted, it is the source for the factual information on Alexander's life contained in the discussion.

best conjectural date for his birth is that proposed by the Franciscan editors of his commentary on the *Sentences* of Peter Lombard — 1186. The details both of his early life and of his education are unknown to us. He may have learned his letters in a provincial English song school, although the history of these institutions in the twelfth century is obscure. Perhaps he received both primary and secondary education at the cathedral school of Lichfield in his native diocese.² It is also possible that he studied grammar in Paris, for grammar masters of distinction were functioning there around the turn of the century.³

It is certain, however, that he studied arts in Paris, since Roger Bacon informs us that Alexander was a regent master in arts there before the prohibition of lectures on the physical books of Aristotle in 1210. Whether or not he was already in Paris studying grammar, he cannot have begun the six-year programme of study leading to the degree of master of arts before his fifteenth year, c. 1200-1201. Whatever the exact date of his matriculation in the arts course, he was at the university at a critical and exciting time in its early history, when it was still forging the customs and regulations by which it would be governed in years to come, and before it possessed written regulations or a charter.

Alexander seems to have begun the study of theology in his late twenties, in 1212 or 1213, after a regency in the faculty of arts of unknown duration. He became in turn a regent master in theology in 1220 or 1221, after five years as a student and three years of 'student teaching' as a bachelor. The church still represented the 'royal road' to preferment in England: royal clerks and bishops filled important posts in church and state, shaping the whole course of the mediaeval English judiciary. At this period the study of theology, at least for a time, was not an unusual course for an ambitious young man of good family who had joined the church in the reasonable expectation of becoming such a clerk. In the mid-thirteenth century, however, there were complaints, recorded by such writers as Matthew Paris, that ambitious young clerks only read canon law and neglected the queen of the sciences.⁴ What sets Alexander apart from other such young men

² N. Orme's survey, *English Schools in the Middle Ages* (London, 1973), contains a list of known English mediaeval schools as an appendix, pp. 293-325. There is a discussion of twelfth- and thirteenth-century schools in chapter 6, pp. 167-93.

³ For grammar masters at Paris, see L. J. Paetow, *The Arts Course at Mediaeval Universities with Special Reference to Grammar and Rhetoric* (Champaign, Ill., 1910), chapter 2, pp. 33-66; for the University of Paris, see H. Rashdall's *The Universities of Europe in the Middle Ages*, 3 vols. (rev. ed. by F. M. Powicke and A. B. Emden; Oxford, 1936), 1.269-584, esp. pp. 271-98 and 471-96.

⁴ For Matthew Paris, see R. Vaughan, *Matthew Paris* (Cambridge, 1958), p. 142. This feeling that studies other than theology revealed 'an eye to the main chance' unsuitable to clerics was not confined to England or to a later date, as is shown by the sermons delivered at the time of the dispersion of the university at Angers and elsewhere after the strike of 1229; an edition of a manuscript collection of these sermons is edited by M. M. Davy in *Les sermons universitaires parisiens de 1230-1231: Contribution à l'histoire de la prédication médiévale* (Études de philosophie médiévale 15; Paris, 1931).

is that he settled in at Paris as a professional theologian after finishing his course, rather than taking up a career in the English church or 'civil service'.

Although, as far as we know, he continued to teach at Paris without interruption until his early forties, when he joined in the removal of the university to Angers as part of the strike of 1229,⁵ he did not forego preferment or financial support from England. In the period prior to 1229 he had held a prebend at Holborn and been a canon of St Paul's (c. 1226-29). In fact, after the university withdrew to Angers, he even returned to England for a visit of about a year, having first represented the masters at Angers on a commission to Rome dealing with the proper place of Aristotle's works in the curriculum.

While in England, Alexander received a canonry and an archdeaconry in his native diocese of Coventry and Lichfield. Perhaps those who had these lucrative canonries and prebends to bestow put some pressure upon Alexander to serve church and crown as he had just served the university. In any case, during the years from 1231 to 1236 Alexander seems, despite his return to Paris in the 1232-33 academic session, to have been drawn into the role of royal clerk. In 1235, Henry III appointed him, together with Simon Langton, the wily and powerful archdeacon of Canterbury and brother of the more famous Stephen Langton, and Fulk Basset, provost of Beverley Minster and the future bishop of London, to act for England in negotiations for the renewal of the truce between England and France. It seems safe to conclude from this mission and the earlier one to Rome that Alexander possessed, in addition to the intellectual gifts demonstrated by his extant writings, diplomatic abilities and a talent for negotiation. At the time of the Anglo-French truce talks, Alexander was still an archdeacon of Coventry. Yet in the next year he was to give up worldly wealth and ecclesiastical dignities alike and enter the Franciscan order as its first great scholar and teacher, bringing the Friars Minor a chair in theology along with his person.

It is perilous to speculate on the motives of those long dead who have left no personal reminiscences, but the events of the mid-1230's in Alexander's life seem to invite such speculation. Why give up a way of life which, if pursued, would lead to advancement in church and state as well as to personal wealth? Had he developed scruples about pluralism and absenteeism which brought him into

⁵ The academic strike of 1229 arose out of the students' resistance to attempts by Paris authorities to exercise legal control over them in the aftermath of a violent confrontation among students and townsmen; the faculty, itself made up of clerics, supported the student claims of clerical immunities. It is discussed by Rashdall, *Universities* 1.334-43 (see note 3 above); for an intriguing sidelight not only on the strike, but also on the theological issues under discussion at this time, see Davy, *Les sermons universitaires parisiens*. Several sermons by friars emphasize the twin evils of absenteeism and pluralism, and it is tempting to see this in the context of the careers of secular masters like Alexander who at this time held simultaneous benefices at two English cathedrals.

sympathy with Franciscan teachings?⁶ Was his decision to join the Friars Minor part of the gradual growth of commitment to God and the study of the *sacra pagina* begun many years earlier when he turned from arts to theology? The proximity in time of this decision to his mission to the French court suggests more radical change, perhaps prompted by new or renewed pressure to serve those who had given him preferment. His sudden change may thus have represented the excising of every lesser claim upon his heart and mind. As far as we know, Alexander's remaining life was passed in the academic environment of Paris without incident, except his involvement in events unavoidable for a senior academic theologian, such as the condemnations of 1241 and 1244, and the Council of Lyons in 1245, perhaps a sign that the talents which recommended him as a diplomat and negotiator in the late 1220's and early 1230's were still recognized within his order. He died, still a regent master in theology, at Paris in August 1245, the same year as his former student and fellow regent master, John de la Rochelle.

In addition to the gloss on the *Sentences* mentioned above, the Franciscans of Quaracchi have edited Alexander's *Quaestiones 'antequam esset frater'*⁷ and have in hand an edition of his *Quaestiones 'postquam. . .'*. As already stated, none of the biblical material has yet been edited, although it has been studied by both Fr. Ignatius Brady and the late Beryl Smalley.⁸ Clearly much work remains to be done in this area of Alexander's extant writings, especially in producing critically edited texts of these commentaries. The difficulty in producing editions of exegetical works, whether they are monastic and meditative or characteristic of the university lecture series, lies chiefly in their great length. It is therefore fortunate that a regent master such as Alexander often began his *postillae* with an opening lecture outlining the themes and content of the book to be studied, thus providing us with a window, at least, on his exegetical presuppositions and methods.

⁶ This is pure speculation and, in fact, what little evidence there is suggests no such change. Contemporary comments collected by the Quaracchi editors show that the *conversio* of Alexander to the Franciscan order caused surprise. Given the contrast between the order's teachings and Alexander's wealth and importance at the time, that reaction is understandable, the more so because there appear to have been no changes in his known positions which suggest a growing sympathy for Franciscanism. An examination of Alexander's disputed questions '*antequam esset frater*' gives no indication that his teachings on matters such as pluralism and evangelical poverty were moving in pro-Franciscan directions.

⁷ *Magistri Alexandri de Hales Quaestiones disputatae 'antequam esset frater'*, 3 vols. (Quaracchi, 1960).

⁸ I. Brady, 'Sacred Scripture in the Early Franciscan School' in *La Sacra Scrittura e i Francescani* (Rome, 1973), pp. 65-80; B. Smalley, 'The Gospels in the Paris Schools in the Late Twelfth and Early Thirteenth Centuries', revised version in a posthumous collection of articles (*The Gospels in the Schools c.1100-c.1280* [London, 1985], pp. 99-196, first appearing in *Franciscan Studies* 39 [1979] 230-54 and 40 [1980] 298-369).

II. THE PRAEFATIO OF THE POSTILLA IN IOHANNEM

Before we can study this *praefatio*, we must be sure of what it consists, that is, how much of the *postilla* is prefatory to the chapter-by-chapter commentary. This is not usually a controversial matter, but in this case both Beryl Smalley and Stegmüller, in his *Repertorium Biblicum* (hereafter cited as *RBib*), subdivide the text in a way which seems to be at variance with the evidence of the manuscripts.⁹ A list of manuscripts, six in all, containing the text of Alexander's *postilla in Iohannem* is given in the *RBib* (no. 1154). Here one finds a series of three incipits:

- 1) Mich. 5 [2] Tu Bethlehem Ephrata parvulus es in millibus Iuda—In hac auctoritate materia huius libri tangitur et forma, scil. modus procedendi. Ex quibus relinquitur causa finalis...ordo vero patet in aliis.
- 2) Cum novum testamentum dividatur a veteri secundum umbram et veritatem.
- 3) In principio erat—Duplex et [*sic*] expositio. Vel ut vocetur ordo qui est temporis vel rei temporalis ad aeternitatem.

The natural interpretation one makes when reading these incipits in *RBib* is that the third is the beginning of the *postilla* proper, whereas the first two mark the beginnings either of two prefaces or perhaps of two sections of a single preface. Certainly that would seem to have been Smalley's interpretation of the evidence as well, for she lists these incipits for the manuscripts to which she had access and posited two prefaces. The first, running from the first to the second of the two incipits given above, she attributes to an unknown author (possibly Alexander) and largely ignores.¹⁰ It is not in one of the three manuscripts which she used (that in the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris), a fact not mentioned in her manuscript descriptions.¹¹ The second preface (the text between the second and third *RBib* incipits) she believes to be Alexander's own preface, at least partly because it 'conform[s] to Alexander's normal pattern'.¹²

Let us examine how the six manuscripts known to contain all or part of the *postilla* set out these divisions in the text. They will be described in more detail later, but for now it is sufficient to say that the manuscripts of Durham (*D*), Paris (*B*), Prague (*P*), and Rheims (*R*) contain the entire *postilla*. The Munich (*M*) and Seville (*S*) manuscripts contain fragments of the *postilla*. The fragment in *M* is four

⁹ F. Stegmüller, *Repertorium Biblicum Medii Aevi*, 11 vols, (Madrid, 1950-80), no. 1154, 2.69-70; Smalley, 'Gospels', pp. 146-49. The present author, while not accepting the same endpoint for the second section as *RBib* and Smalley, nevertheless accepted the division into two sections in principle, and was thus equally at fault in ignoring the manuscript evidence in her first study of the *praefatio*, a research report submitted in fulfillment of the MSL degree at the Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies in 1981.

¹⁰ Smalley, 'Gospels', p. 149.

¹¹ Smalley, 'Gospels', p. 148.

¹² Smalley, 'Gospels', p. 149.

folios in length and runs from the beginning of the *praefatio*. The fragment in *S* likewise runs from the beginning of the *praefatio*, but is nineteen folios long. *DPR* attribute the *postilla* to Alexander explicitly. *M* has the title 'super Iohannem prologus' in a hand not that of the text; *S* is entitled 'particula postillarum super Iohannem', also in a different hand than that of the text. It is probable that in both the latter cases these titles were applied to the surviving fragments either when they were rescued from the fate which befell the manuscripts to which they originally belonged or else when those fragments were combined with other texts to form new codices. *B* has no legible title or ascription of authorship at the opening, but at some time, possibly when the two texts it now contains were combined into one codex, a contents list was added, describing the *postilla* as 'Glose super totum euuangelium Iohannis per modum postille'.¹³

The first *RBib praefatio* (that running from the first to the second *RBib* incipits) is found in five of the six manuscripts: *B* is the only one which does not contain this text. All those five manuscripts mark the division between this text and the rest of the *postilla* plainly with some marker. In *D*, the scribe skipped four lines, gave the title 'incipit tractatus magistri alexandri de hales super Iohannem euangelistam', and began 'Cvm nouum testamentum' on a new line with a decorated and apparently rubricated ornamental capital 'C' six lines high. The scribe of *M* placed a long *paragraphus* symbol (§), hung in the margin of the left column, before 'Cum nouum testamentum'. In *P*, the scribe began a new page and column with 'Cvm nouum testamentum'. In *R*, the scribe used a capitulum symbol (¶) to mark out 'cum nouum testamentum'. The scribe of *S* used a *paragraphus* sign.

In all these manuscripts the commentary is subdivided according to the chapters of the gospel, and all clearly indicate where the section of the commentary on each chapter of the gospel begins either by using marginal numbers, *paragraphus* and *capitulum* signs, or a combination of these methods. But none of them signals a transition to a new chapter of the gospel between 'Cum nouum testamentum' and the beginning of the commentary on chapter two. In all six manuscripts the third *RBib* incipit appears to be part of a longer sentence: 'Et notandum quod cum [cum *BDMRS*, quod *P*] dicitur in principio duplex est expositio, uel ut uocetur [notetur *P*] ordo qui est temporis uel rei temporalis ad eternitatem'.¹⁴ This sentence is not marked by any text division symbol in *BDMRS*, although it is set off by a *capitulum* sign in *P*.

It appears from this that Alexander's commentary on chapter one of John begins with 'Cum nouum testamentum' (or rather that all the copyists thought it did) and that this is also the beginning of the text of the *postilla* proper. The text chosen by Stegmüller and Smalley as a third incipit does not seem to mark the beginning

¹³ *B*, fol. 148.

¹⁴ *B*, fol. 1rb; *D*, fol. 156va; *M*, fol. 111vb; *P*, fol. 3vb; *R*, fol. 206ra; *S*, fol. 157ra.

of a major section of the commentary in any of the manuscripts; in fact, it appears to be part of a longer sentence. Rather, the manuscripts support the theory that this *postilla* contains a short *praefatio*, edited below, whose incipit corresponds to the first one given in the *RBib*, and that its commentary on chapter one of the gospel begins with the second *RBib* incipit. The third *RBib* incipit would seem to represent a misunderstanding of the text divisions of the work.

However, a puzzle remains: why should the commentary on chapter one begin with a summary of some of the material covered (albeit from a somewhat different angle) in the *praefatio*? Smalley's general hypothesis on the composition of Alexander's gospel postills as a group indirectly offers a possible explanation of this problem without resorting to the notion of two prefaces or a denial of authenticity to the *praefatio*.¹⁵ But because a full consideration of this question depends upon the dating of this postill within Alexander's academic career, at this point it would be preferable to continue with a discussion of the contents and return to the problem of the prefaces in the dating section (pp. 11-14 below).

As an introductory lecture for a university course, a *praefatio* embodies counsels of perfection. Although, unlike a modern professor, Alexander does not give out a timetable for the year's work, he does make clear his intentions and the methodology by which he proceeds. While recognizing that the actual course might have been very different from the intended course, we may still learn a great deal about Alexander as an exegete from the way in which he analyzed and presented the Fourth Gospel for teaching purposes.

Alexander's preface is expository, and does not deal with the traditional prefaces (ascribed to Augustine and Jerome) on John. Not all prefaces to postills follow this pattern. Some, although similar in intention, are far more succinct and even terse in their explanations. Others do gloss the traditional prefaces, all of which were believed in the thirteenth century to be patristic and which appeared in manuscripts of the Bible or the *Glossa ordinaria*. Still others combined these two patterns, presenting an extremely abbreviated exposition of the themes of the book combined with a gloss on the traditional preface(s) to that book. Such a combination of patterns sometimes results in two opening lectures, one expository and one dealing with the traditional preface(s).

Like most prefaces of the expository type, Alexander's works out the analysis of the gospel by means of an extended scriptural quotation from which salient points are extracted by allegorical, numerological, etymological, or other devices. It is in this respect similar in organization to mediaeval sermons, in which such scriptural authorities are referred to as *themata*, and serve the same function. This use of a *thema* is perhaps a sign of the oral lecture behind the written *praefatio*. Very often, as Smalley has pointed out, the quotations, their interpretations, and

¹⁵ Smalley, 'Gospels', p. 123.

much of the prefaces themselves were not only second-hand and threadbare with age, but they had only the most tenuous relationship to the text as well.¹⁶ Here the ruling quotation is very appropriate to a commentary on one of the gospels since it is found as a prophecy of the birth of Christ in both Mt 2:2 and Jo 7:42. It is Micah 5:2-3a:

But you, O Bethlehem Ephrathah, who are little to be among the clans of Judah, from you shall come forth for me one who is to be ruler in Israel, whose origin is from of old, from ancient days. Therefore he shall give them up, until the time when she who is in travail has brought forth. . . (RSV).

What is unusual is that one phrase, 'ab initio' (RSV 'from of old'), is omitted when the verses are given at the opening of the *praefatio* in all five manuscripts, but when the quotation is split up into *clausulae* for analysis during Alexander's main argument, 'ab initio' occurs in its proper order as a *clausula*.

Over the fifteen paragraphs of the preface, Alexander uses the explanation of this Old Testament passage to reveal the matter, form, and goal of John's Gospel. He also uses the analysis of the name 'Micah' (as defined by Jerome in his *Liber interpretationis hebraicorum nominum*) to reveal the author(s) of that gospel. This preface is itself unevenly divided, since half of it, the first eight paragraphs, is devoted to the subject matter (*materia* or *causa materialis*) of John's Gospel, leaving the form, goal, and author for the remaining half. In a nutshell, the subject matter is the eternal generation and temporal birth of Christ and 'our' spiritual birth and rebirth (paragraph 1). 'We' refers, presumably, to the individual members of the Christian church rather than to Alexander and his hearers or readers.

In subsequent paragraphs, the expressions 'temporal procession' and 'eternal procession' (paragraphs 3, 4, 5, 6) are used for Christ's two 'births' (paragraphs 4, 5, 6), particularly as the scriptural *auctoritas*, Micah 5:2-3a, is broken up into *clausulae* for detailed analysis. However, the distinction appears to be methodological (or perhaps even stylistic) rather than real, for in paragraphs 7 and 8 they are made explicitly synonymous. Thus Alexander reaffirms in paragraph 7 that this *materia* is four-fold: first, the two processions or births of Christ, eternal and temporal; and second, 'our' spiritual birth in catechetical instruction and baptism, and ultimate rebirth.

At the beginning of the discussion of *materia* (paragraphs 2 and 3), Alexander asks two questions which are raised by his consideration of the subject matter of John's Gospel. First, why is this subject matter so different from that of the other three gospels? Alexander answers that John needed to present a different subject

¹⁶ B. Smalley, *The Study of the Bible in the Middle Ages*, 2nd edition (Oxford, 1952; rpt., Notre Dame, 1964), pp. 131-32 and 217.

matter because the other evangelists did not deal fully either with the eternal generation of Christ or with the union of the human nature with the divine in the Incarnation. Furthermore, he points out that they only began to tell of the Lord's *gesta* during the final year of the ministry, and so John supplemented their subject matter by filling in these gaps and completing the gospel story (paragraph 2).

The second question is related to the first, and looks ahead to the summary of the prefatory matter at the very beginning of the lengthy commentary on the first chapter. In his *auctoritas* from the prophet Micah, Alexander finds that the temporal birth of Christ is described first, but in John the eternal generation is described first. Why? For an answer, Alexander turns first to a philosophical distinction, and then to the place of John within all four gospels considered as a unit. The prophet moves in his consideration from that which is more surely known by human beings, the temporal birth of Christ, to that which is less securely known, the eternal generation. But the evangelist follows the order of nature, considering first that which is better known in itself, eternal generation, and only then the temporal birth to which the eternal is properly prior. However, the question does not really arise when one considers the four gospels as a unit, for then the order of revelation is the same both in the prophet and in the gospels. Like the verse of Micah, the gospel revelation proceeds from the temporal birth, in Matthew, to the eternal generation, in John (paragraph 3). Alexander refers again to the question of the order of presentation of material (*ordo*) at the end of the *praefatio*, and reaffirms there that the order cannot be fully explained on the basis of the words of Micah (see below, pp. 10-11).

In paragraph 9, Alexander moves to a consideration of the *forma* (also referred to as *causa formalis* and *modus procedendi*) adopted by the evangelist. Not surprisingly, this method of proceeding is closely related to the order derived from Alexander's previous discussion. Alexander sets out John's method of proceeding in detail:

1. the eternal and temporal procession of Christ, dealt with in chapter 1 of the gospel;
2. 'our' spiritual birth in baptism, not linked here with a specific chapter of the gospel;
3. 'our' spiritual nourishment in the eucharist, chapters 6 and 7;
4. 'our' spiritual illumination, chapters 8 and 9;
5. 'our' spiritual guidance, chapter 10;
6. the Passion, chapters 11-19; and
7. the Resurrection and 'our' spiritual rebirth in glory, chapters 20-21.

A similar, but more complete schema is repeated at the beginning of the commentary on chapter 1 of the gospel. There, chapters 3 to 6 of the gospel are explicitly linked to the second topic. Chapter 2 of John is ignored in this presentation, no doubt because it cannot easily be fitted in.

Alexander next discusses the *intentio* or *causa finalis* in paragraph 11, and states it in two ways, both relying at least in part upon New Testament language. Alexander says that the end (*finis*) of the Gospel is that, through him who is a son by nature, 'we' may become sons by adoption, in the present in grace and in the future by glory. In somewhat more technical terminology, he also states that the end is that, through the eternal and temporal processions of Christ, 'we' may achieve spiritual birth in the present and rebirth in the future. This second formulation, which uses terminology similar to that used to describe both the matter and form of John in earlier paragraphs, links the *causa finalis* more closely verbally with them both.

These three causes, material, formal, and final, have a common theme as well as some common terminology. Each emphasizes in some way a link between the experience of Christ and that of the Christian: the two processions or generations of Christ are always presented by Alexander as connected with the spiritual birth and rebirth of individual Christians, which take place both through the sacraments of baptism and the eucharist and through Christ's own redemptive acts. The explanations we have just seen of the matter and form of John underline this interconnection between the generations of Christ and the generation and regeneration of Christians; the end or intention emphasizes the instrumentality of Christ in human redemption and so approaches the same point from another angle. Thus in the *praefatio*, at least, Alexander sets his exposition of John in an essentially pastoral context. Whether he turns to the matter, the form, or the intention, he relates what is central to the understanding of the gospel to what is central in the Christian life. In examining the form in particular, Alexander patterns the narrative progression of the gospel on the experiential progress of the Christian life from spiritual birth in baptism to spiritual rebirth in glory.

In paragraph 12, Alexander moves on to the efficient cause of John's Gospel. It is, according to his interpretation, two-fold: there is the Holy Spirit '*penes quam residet auctoritas*', and there is John the Evangelist, '*efficiens ut minister*'. The latter answers the question posed by the meaning of the name of the prophet Micah whose words have illuminated the other causes. That meaning in Hebrew is, according to Alexander, 'who is this man?' This question, taken as one of wonder and admiration, is the key to a long, very traditionally composed, section (paragraphs 13-14) in praise of the Evangelist. It draws on lore handed down in Jerome's preface to John, although it is not a commentary on it, and expresses its praise through the traditional image of the eagle drawn from the account of the prophet's vision in Ezekiel 1:4-14.

In paragraph 15, the previous matter is summarized very briefly. It ends with a brief reference to the *ordo*, or order of presentation, which must be elucidated by other means than the explication of Micah 5:2-3a. This is probably an allusion to the earlier discussion in paragraph 3, in which Alexander used the order of

presentation in the gospels as a unit to explain an apparent discrepancy between the Old Testament *auctoritas* and John (see above, p. 9).

III. DATING

At what point in Alexander's career is the *postilla in Iohannem* to be placed? Did he lecture on John before or after joining the Friars Minor? Brady's article, referred to in section I above, contains an attempted reconstruction of Alexander's career. Brady's dating rests upon his assumption that a close relationship exists between questions chosen for disputation by a given regent master at a given time and the biblical books being postillated by the same scholar at the same time. For him, this relationship is so close that Alexander's *quaestiones 'antequam'* can act as a guide to the books upon which he lectured during the years c. 1220-1236 when those questions were disputed. Examining those *quaestiones*, then, in light of this assumption, Brady suggests that Alexander probably postillated the other gospels as well as several of the Pauline epistles while he was a secular master in theology prior to 1236.¹⁷ It does not seem unreasonable, therefore, to make the further assumption that Alexander might have commented on John as well during the same period, particularly since the *praefatio* contains comparisons between John and the Synoptics, especially Matthew.

But subsequent research, based on an internal examination of Alexander's surviving gospel postills, suggests that Brady's conclusions need some modification. In addition to other arguments for a date after Alexander joined the Friars Minor, Smalley argued from a comparison of quotations in the gospel *postillae* of the Dominican master Hugh of St. Cher and in Alexander's that either they used a common source or Alexander quoted Hugh as an intermediate source.¹⁸ In fact, it seems very probable that Alexander's postill on Matthew in particular drew upon Hugh's.¹⁹

Hugh had performed the feat, magisterial in every sense of the word, of postillating the entire Bible in a regency of five years from 1230 to 1235.²⁰ Undoubtedly, his achievement, like that of many prolific modern scholars, rests upon the shoulders of unsung research assistants, such as more junior friars or *baccalaurei biblici*.²¹ So complete a course of lectures would naturally have

¹⁷ Brady, 'Sacred Scripture', pp. 70-71.

¹⁸ Smalley, 'Gospels', pp. 122-23.

¹⁹ In an additional note on p. 124 of 'Gospels', Smalley refers to the work of Dr. J. H. A. van Banning, who, in an unpublished D.Phil. thesis on deposit in the Bodleian Library, compares Alexander's and Hugh's postills on Matthew with a work of Pseudo-Chrysostom. I have been unable to consult this thesis, and have relied on Smalley's summary of its conclusions.

²⁰ Smalley, *Study*, p. 272.

²¹ See Smalley, 'Gospels', p. 120, for a reference to Fr. H. Dondaine's suggestion that a research team of friars helped Hugh in his endeavours.

influenced other regent masters lecturing at about that time, among whom was Alexander. But given the dates of Hugh's regency, if Alexander did not write his gospel postills until after Hugh had finished his (as Smalley's demonstration of interdependence would seem to suggest), the composition of the gospel postills, including that on John, must be placed after 1236, the year in which Alexander entered the Friars Minor, unless he 'tossed off' some or all of them during 1235, while he was also acting as a negotiator for the English crown.

But Alexander's *postillae* are not wholly dependent upon those of Hugh. Smalley is quick to point out the fundamental independence of Alexander's teaching.²² Even if we consider only the evidence of quotations from other exegetes, each man quotes from sources not found in the other. In fact, not all of Alexander's quotations from sources common to both derive from Hugh as an intermediary.

The assumption, therefore, based on Brady, that the postills as we now have them were delivered in the period before Alexander's *conversio* creates several problems. The first is Alexander's at least partial reliance on Hugh of St. Cher as a source for quotations from earlier teaching. Another is summarized by Smalley:

...the practice of lecturing on large numbers of biblical books, and circulating the lecture course, went out of fashion in the secular schools after Langton's departure in 1206.... The Mendicants revived the practice of lecturing on *sacra pagina* extensively and 'publishing' their lectures.... Alexander would fit into the pattern better if he lectured on Scripture *postquam*.²³

On the other hand, the assumption that he did not comment on the gospels at all until the period after 1236 is also alive with difficulties. The chief problem is one of probability. Alexander was regent master in theology for fifteen or sixteen years before becoming a Franciscan and was actively teaching for at least eleven or twelve of those years — 1220 or 1221 to 1229, then 1232 to 1235. Although, as we have seen above, Smalley argues that extensive commenting on the Bible went out of fashion between Stephen Langton and Hugh, Brady has shown that, in fact, regent masters were expected to comment on one book from each Testament in a given academic year. To comment on two books a year is not a great deal in comparison to Hugh's commenting on the entire Bible in five years, to be sure, but it offers ample opportunity for commenting on the four gospels, which were becoming popular teaching texts in the late twelfth and thirteenth centuries.²⁴

²² Smalley, 'Gospels', pp. 123, 164-65.

²³ Smalley, 'Gospels', pp. 121-22.

²⁴ Smalley outlines the growth of interest in the Bible during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, during which, as she says, '[t]he gospels took a more central place in the syllabus', in 'Some Gospel Commentaries of the Early Twelfth Century', another article reprinted in *The Gospels in the Schools*, 1-35, especially 2. Indeed, this entire collection is testimony to the growing role of gospel commentaries in the curriculum.

There is a third possibility, described by Smalley as '[a]n attractive hypothesis',²⁵ that Alexander postillated the gospels first as a secular and then again after joining the Friars Minor. This possibility, to which we briefly alluded in Section II above, takes into account the arguments both for and against the other two theories, and also explains some features of the postill on John in particular.

Suppose, then, that Alexander, having already lectured on John at an earlier period in his academic career, decided to lecture on it again to the students in the Franciscan *studium* at Paris sometime after 1236. In preparation for this second lecture course, he would have worked up either earlier lectures or his own notes, adding some new material of which he had learned in the interim, some of it from his Dominican colleague, Hugh of St. Cher. He would have provided a new opening lecture, our *prefatio*, of an analytical character, working the material from the original opening lecture into the commentary on chapter 1 of the gospel. Although some repetition of material results, it may be that Alexander felt a need to summarize again the salient points of his overview of the gospel (the *ordo* and the *modus procedendi*) because in the new preface he had been very much concerned to lay out clearly the proper application of an expository technique for textual analysis which was comparatively new in exegetical circles, the four Aristotelian causes.

The Aristotelian causes — material, formal, final, and efficient — were not originally used in mediaeval instruction as a tool for analyzing a text in theology.²⁶ Rather, they were first used in mediaeval schools as terms and techniques in arts instruction. Since the twelfth century, secular writings and their authors had been introduced to students by using the four causes as a framework. The analogous technique usually used in theology since some time in the twelfth century had been to combine the terms *materia* (subject matter), *forma* (form), *processus* (or *modus procedendi* or *agendi*) (procedural method), and *intentio* (intention) with a description of the human author.

It is not surprising that the Aristotelian technique, widespread for the teaching of secular authors, would eventually come to be used for explaining biblical books. In fact, the exegetical technique outlined above was itself borrowed from the study of secular authors, possibly by Abelard. Given an academic system in which inception in arts or its equivalent was required as a prerequisite for higher education in theology, it was probably inevitable that someone with a talent for synthetic thought would put the two systems together. It is now impossible to say with certainty who did it first. But it was certainly a relatively new technique, and

²⁵ Smalley, 'Gospels', p. 123.

²⁶ For the following discussion, see Smalley, *Study*, pp. 216-17, and R. W. Hunt, 'The Introductions to the "Artes" in the Twelfth Century' in *Studia Mediaevalia in honorem admodum Raymundi Josephi Martin* (Bruges, 1948), pp. 85-112.

one Hugh had used only occasionally.²⁷ Clearly Alexander felt it was necessary to link the terminology of the old system with that of the new very explicitly, and in such a way that the meaning of the new terms in an exegetical context would be completely clear.

It is not possible to prove any of these hypotheses or assumptions, but, unlike either of the others, this reconstruction does answer more questions than it raises. On the basis of it, a date in the late 1230's can tentatively be assigned to the *postilla in Iohannem*. It is likely that, in the production of a critical edition of the whole *postilla*, some source or other evidence that will allow a firmer date to be set will come to light.

IV. THE MANUSCRIPTS

There are six manuscripts which contain all or part of the *postilla in Iohannem*. The following are descriptions of the five manuscripts which contain the *praefatio*, based upon a careful examination of the manuscripts in microfilm, the printed catalogues where available, and Smalley's descriptions of those known to her.²⁸ Although I have seen these manuscripts only in microfilm, in many cases the film quality permitted the observation of such features as watermarks and drypointing.

1. Durham, Cathedral Library A.II.2 (*D*); parchment; 238 folios; the postill on John, fols. 155va-238va. It contains Alexander's postills on the four gospels. The text is written in double columns of approximately 57 lines per column, in a small, closely-written text hand of what appears to be the thirteenth century. It appears that the writing surface was prepared by marking out two rectangular boxes in drypoint or pencil for the columns, and then ruling across from the outer margin of column a to the outer margin of column b. There are many marginalia, a few in the text hand, but most of them in a note hand (*DI*): these consist both of corrections and of annotations, some of which are linked by matching sigla either to the text or to extended annotations at the foot of the folios. The manuscript was a bequest to the chapter from a Master Gilbert Aristoteles, about whom very little is known. He was rector of Branxton parish in Northumberland at some time before 1252, when it ceased to have a rector, but was no longer its rector at that time.²⁹ We do not know when he died, or to what parish, if any, he was then

²⁷ Hugh used some or all of the causes in three prefaces, those to Mark, Acts, and Philipppians. Only in the preface to Acts does he explicitly connect the new and old systems as Alexander does here, and it is in a very terse and brief form. There is no modern edition of Hugh's postills, and I have used the Venice *Opera omnia* of 1732 in 8 volumes; these three prefaces can be found at 6.90, 7.278, and 7.197.

²⁸ Smalley's description of the manuscripts containing the *postilla in Iohannem* which she consulted are in 'Gospels', pp. 146-49.

²⁹ Smalley, 'Gospels', pp. 146-47.

assigned. It is not unreasonable to conjecture that he acquired the text in Paris and brought it with him to England but, if so, it must be a very early copy indeed. Smalley has a full description with incipits and explicits for all four postills.

2. Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek C1m 17047 (*M*); parchment; 114 folios; fragment of the postill on John, fols. 111ra-14vb. This manuscript is identified by the catalogue as of the twelfth century, and part of it may well be: it is a grab bag of fragments: fols. 4r-42v and fols. 107r-14v appear to be in the same hand, and to consist of material on Matthew and Luke, and Luke and John, respectively. Stegmüller has also identified fols. 19r-26v as Alexander's work (*RBib* 1153). It seems probable that all the material in the same hand comes from the same source, although the fragmentary nature of the text makes identification difficult. The hand is large, fairly careless, and highly abbreviated. It seems to be of the thirteenth century, and does not appear to have been written by a professional scribe. There are double columns of about 62 lines per column, and no trace of ruling is visible. These last folios, containing the fragment on John, are very difficult to read due to creasing, corrosion of ink through from the other side of folios, and general wear and fading. Not used by Smalley.

3. Prague, Knihovna metropolitni kapituli A 108/3 (*P*); paper; 204 folios; fols. 1-198va is the postill, fols. 198vb-204va is a sermon of St. Augustine on John 1.1, which from its incipit appears to be tractatus I of his *Tractatus in Iohannis euangelium*. There are double columns of about 43 lines to the column; the hand is large and somewhat irregular, and appears to be mid-fifteenth century. There are some corrections made interlinearly or marginally, but, because they usually consist of no more than a few letters, it is not possible to tell whether they are by the same hand writing more compactly or by a second scribe. It is possible to see on the microfilm the watermark of the paper, which is consistent with a northern Italian, German, or even Bohemian origin. Thus it is possible that this manuscript was produced in Prague itself for the chapter library, of which it was formerly the property. It is interesting, if ultimately futile, to speculate how or why the *postilla* came to Prague: could an interest in Wycliffite writings have led some Bohemian students to discover other, more orthodox English theologians? Not used by Smalley.

4. Reims, Bibliothèque Municipale 162 (*R*); parchment; 306 folios; the *postilla in Iohannem* is on fols. 205ra-306vb. It contains Alexander's postills on all four gospels. It is written in a very small, clear text hand of the thirteenth century in double columns of about 50 lines a column. The writing surface was elaborately prepared by marking out rectangular boxes with wide margins and ruling in drypoint or pencil. Someone has doodled in the margins with drypoint or pencil, and the text has been annotated in near-contemporary hands. Someone has also written next to some sections of the text the Sundays or feast days whose gospel readings are being commented on. The manuscript was given to the chapter by Guy

de Roye, archbishop of Rheims from 1390 to 1409, but it must have been copied considerably prior to his archiepiscopate. Used and briefly described by Smalley.

5. Seville, Biblioteca Capitulare y Columbina 7.2.26 (*S*); 176 folios; fols. 156ra-175va contain a fragment of the postill on John. The manuscript is made up of a number of different texts from various periods, and has been catalogued by a post-mediaeval hand at the beginning. The postill fragment is in a close-written, heavily abbreviated, professional text hand in double columns of about 60 lines a column. On fols. 163rb-163va, the hand changes briefly and becomes larger and more running, but it is difficult to tell whether it is a different scribe, or the same person writing more quickly. Not used by Smalley.

It is not yet possible to be certain of the relationship among the five manuscripts containing the *praefatio*. However, *MRS* often agree against *DP*, demonstrating the existence of at least two families. None of the manuscripts seems to be a copy of the others. It seems probable that all derive from a defective copy, since the omission of 'ab initio' in the quotation from Micah cannot be authorial and seems unlikely to have originated independently. The annotator and corrector of *D* may have had access to another manuscript although no other manuscripts are known to have been in England. If so, it too must have lacked 'ab initio'. The blank spaces and odd guesses occasionally found in *MRS* suggest that their scribes were copying manuscripts they found difficult to read. It would be inappropriate to attempt to analyze the relationships among the manuscripts more closely until more of the text has been edited and the affiliation of *B* (which does not contain the *praefatio*) is clear. Where the two families disagree, the reading which seems to make the best sense and to fit in stylistically with the whole is chosen. *DP* does seem to preserve more 'sensible' readings than *MRS*, but neither the family nor either of its individual members seems to deserve to be regarded unquestioningly as the 'best text'. Emendation has been avoided except where it seems necessary for sense, and supplied text is in pointed brackets ('< >').

Only variants which seem significant are listed in the critical apparatus. Thus purely orthographic variation, such as 'ammirabilis' for 'admirabilis', and erratic word separation are silently passed over unless another word or grammatical form results, e.g., 'adeo' for 'a deo'. Scribal corrections are passed over unless they suggest either a corrector at work (difficult to judge from a microfilm) or a check against another manuscript. The orthography of the edition is that of the *Oxford Latin Dictionary*, now the standard reference work for classical Latin. Inversions of order, such as the variant 'est duplex' for 'duplex est', have normally been listed, except for one instance. *M* usually gives the order of the chapter number and name of a book of the Bible in the opposite order from that of the other manuscripts. The order of the majority has been followed, and *M*'s inversion is silently passed over, because of the large number of biblical references. All punctuation is editorial.

ALEXANDER DE HALLES
EGREGIUS POSTILLATOR ET DOCTOR
SUPER IOHANNEM EWANGELISTAM

<I praefatio>

5 (1) 5 Mich: Tu Bethleem Effrata, paruulus es in milibus Iuda; ex te mihi egredietur qui sit dominator in Israel, et egressus eius <ab initio> a diebus aeternitatis; propter hoc dabit eos usque ad tempus in quo parturiens pariet. In hac auctoritate materia huius libri tangitur, tangitur etiam forma (scilicet modus procedendi), ex quibus relinquitur causa finalis. Causa uero efficiens notatur in
10 ipso Michea qui prophetauit. Materia uero tangitur quia euangelium istud est de generatione Christi aeterna et temporali, et de nostra generatione spiritali et regeneratione quod totum tangitur in hac auctoritate. Unde si consideremus in genere, liber iste est de generatione Christi et de generatione membrorum. Ipse Christus est Filius per naturam, nos filii per adoptionem. Competit autem
15 utrobique generatio. Nam de generatione Christi dicitur in principio libri, de nostra generatione dicitur consequenter. De generatione Christi et nostra habetur 1 Jo 5: *Omnis qui diligit eum qui genuit, diligit et eum qui natus est ex Deo, et praemittitur: Omnis qui credit quod Iesus Christus est, ex Deo natus est.*

(2) Cum enim alii euangelistae locuti essent de potentia regali Christi, de
20 sapientia eius in quantum fuit magister, de sanctitate eius in quantum sacerdos, non sunt autem locuti pariter de generatione aeterna et de unione humanae naturae cum diuina. Propter quod beatus Iohannes, supplens ea quae minus dicebantur ab aliis, locutus est de aeterna generatione et de ipsa incarnatione, ut per illam descenderet

5-7 Mich 5:2-3a 17 1 Jo 5:1b 18 1 Jo 5:1a

1-3 *titulum om. DR*, super Iohannem prologus *M*, particula postillarum super Iohannem *S* 5
5 Mich: Tu] Tu nichil in *P* mihi] enim *M* 6 eius] est *S* 7 aeternitatis] *om. P*, *add. P* aut
PI in] *om. S* parturiens] parturens *M* *R* *add.* par[cut]ies ante pariet 8 hac] hanc *D*
materia huius libri tangitur] tangitur materia huius libri *DP* tangitur etiam] et *M* 10 quia]
quod *M* 11-13 spiritali et ... est de generatione] *om. P* 13 genere] generatione *R* liber
iste] iste liber *R* est] *s.s. D* 15 Christi] *P* aut *PI* *corr.* ex Christus in principio] primo
P libri] *om. PS* 16 dicitur] *om. P* de generatione Christi] *om. P* 17 qui¹] *om. DMPR*
et eum] etc *MR* 18 Iesus] *om. P* *DP* *add.* de generatione utraque est ueritas post est¹
20 in quantum¹] nunquam *S* *P* *add.* fuit post quantum² 21 sunt] fuerunt *P* autem lo-
cuti] locuti ante *P*, locuti autem *D* pariter] parum *DMRS* generatione] genere *D* sed *corr.* in
margin. sinis. DI cum] in *M* 22 minus] unius *S* dicebantur] dicebatur *S* 23 illam] eam
P descenderet] descendens *MRS* nostram] spatium in *M* et] quia *M* illo] *P* aut *PI*
corr. ex illud

P 1rb

ad nostram spiritalem generationem et regenerationem. Unde de illo potest dici
 25 illud quod dicitur Eccli 33: *Ego nouissimus uigilaui quasi qui colligit racemos / post uindemiatores in benedictione et ipse separaui et, quasi qui uindemiatur, repleui torcular.* Nam cum Dominus duobus annis praedicauerit, sequentis anni gesta narrauerunt alii euangelistae post incarcerationem Iohannis. Gesta uero praecedentis anni narrat beatus Iohannes cum quibusdam miraculis sequentis anni usque ad
 30 suam passionem quae fuit in tertio anno. Et propter hoc bene dicitur quod ipse separauit et quod ipse post uindemiatores collegit et torcular repleuit. Quid enim est torcular nisi doctrina passionis quae completa est in his quae superaddidit beatus Iohannes his quae dicta sunt ab aliis euangelistis?

(3) In praecedenti uero auctoritate tangitur generatio Christi temporalis et
 35 aeterna per hoc quod dicitur: **Tu Bethleem** etc. Sed praemittitur temporalis in auctoritate prophetica et subiungitur aeterna; econtrario uero dicitur in hoc euangelio. Nam primo loquitur de aeterna processione Filii, deinde de temporali. Ad quod respondendum est quod propheta respiciebat ad illud quod manifestus erat, ut per processionem temporalem ueniremus ad cognitionem processionis
 40 aeternae; euangelista uero respiciebat ordinem secundum naturam. A prioribus ergo et notioribus quoad nos incepit propheta, a prioribus et notioribus secundum naturam euangelista. Et notandum quod secundum ordinem euangeliorum similis est ordo cum propheta, nam Mattheus generationem eius temporalem quae est in Bethleem describit, Iohannes uero eius aeternam generationem.

45 (4) Dicitur ergo **Tu Bethleem** etc. Describitur in tribus ciuitas in qua natus est Dominus in hoc quod dicitur **Bethleem**, in hoc quod dicitur **Effrata**, in hoc quod dicitur **paruulus es in milibus Iuda**, ut commendetur ecclesia in tribus. In

 25-27 Eccli 33:16-17

24-25 dici illud quod] dicit quod illud S 25 illud] D aut D1 corr. ex ut, P aut P1 corr. ex aliud ut vid. dicitur] om. M Eccli] ecclesiastico R, ecclesiasticus MS 26 quasi] quare MR qui] om. M, spatium in R 28 incarcerationem] incarnationem DMPS, D1 corr. in marg. sinis. incarcerationem gesta uero] gesta nec RS, D aut D1 corr. ex gestauit 29 usque] licet P 30 passionem] ascensionem DP bene] om. M bene dicitur] benedicitur S 31 et¹] id est P uindemiatores] uindemiantes M 32 quae completa est] incompleta P superaddidit] superaddit M 33 ab aliis] aberaiis P 35 per hoc quod] et propter hoc P 36 et] om. P uero] autem R 36-37 in hoc euangelio] om. S 37 nam primo loquitur] om. MRS deinde] dictum RS post temporali add. in hoc euangelio S 38 ad²] om. M 39 ut per processionem temporalem] in processione temporali M ueniremus] uenit eius M 40 euangelista] euangelicam MS uero] non M, nec RS respiciebat] respicit DP 41 a prioribus et] D1 add. Nota in marg. sinis. iuxta lineam 42 post naturam add. propheta P euangelista] euangeliscat P euangeliorum] S corr. ex euangelistorum 43 eius] om. MRS quae] om. M quae est] om. DPS 44 eius] om. P eius aeternam] aeternam eius M 45 ergo] uero P etc] om. M 46 Dominus] deus P Effrata] eufrata M 47 es] om. M commendetur] ostenderetur P

sapientia, per hoc quod dicitur **Bethleem**: / Bethleem enim 'domus panis' interpretatur, in pane uero sapientia intelligitur. Efrata uero interpretatur 'fructifera', in quo notatur uir/tutum plenitudo, scilicet fructuum Spiritus Sancti. Sed quia istae duae non conueniunt nisi adsit humilitas, ideo sequitur **paruulus** etc. Unde Gregorius, 'Qui sine humilitate uirtutes congregat quasi qui puluerem in uentum portat'. Notatur ergo ecclesia in qua fuit temporalis generatio.

(5) Sequitur **ex te egredietur qui sit dominator in Israel**. Notatur hic processio temporalis, unde 2 Mt: *Sciscitabatur ab eis ubi Christus nasceretur, at illi dixerunt, in Bethleem Iude*. Et quia primo in euangelio describitur potentia Christi secundum quam rex erat, ideo sequitur **qui dominator erit in Israel**, unde 2 Mt de regno eius inquitur cum dicitur *ubi est qui natus est rex Iudeorum*, in psalmo: *Dominabitur a / mari usque ad mare*.

(6) **Et egressus eius** etc: notatur hic processio aeterna de qua dicitur 16 Jo *Exiui a Patre et ueni in mundum*. Sed duo notantur in hoc quod dicitur **ab initio**, et sequitur **a diebus aeternitatis**. Notatur enim per hoc quod dicitur **ab initio** quod Pater / est principium Filii. Filius enim quod habet habet a Patre, 5 Jo: *Non possum ego a memetipso facere quicquam*. Unde processio Filii a Patre notatur per hoc quod dicitur **ab initio**. Pater enim est principium Filii. Per hoc autem quod sequitur **a diebus aeternitatis**, notatur duratio ut distinguatur generatio aeterna a temporali. Et notandum quod **dies aeternitatis** dicuntur non quia sit ibi pluralitas (sicut est secundum naturalium dierum modum), sed hoc est secundum / comparisonem aeternitatis ad tempus. Quia enim aeternitas excellit tempus, ideo dicuntur **dies aeternitatis** secundum quod habetur in psalmo: *Cogitauit dies antiquos et annos aeternos in mente habui*.

(7) Haec processio aeterna notatur ibi *In principio erat Verbum et Verbum erat apud Deum*; / temporalis uero (quae hic praemittitur) notatur ibi *et Verbum caro*

48-49 Hieronymus, *Hebraicae quaestiones in Genesim* 35.19 (CCL 72.43); cf *Liber interpretationis Hebraicorum nominum* (CCL 72.99, 119). 52-53 Gregorius, *XL homelia in Euangelia* 1.7 (PL 76.1103). 55-56 Mt 2:4b-5 58 Mt 2:2 58-59 Ps 71:8 Vlg 60-61 Jo 16:28 63-64 Jo 5:30a 70-71 Ps 76:6 Vlg 72-73 Jo 1:1 73-74 Jo 1:14

48 domus panis] panis domus P 49 uero²] om. M interpretatur] intelligitur P fructifera] frugifera in marg. sub fructifera glossauit D1 50 scilicet] quasi DP fructuum] furnarium D, vinarium DIP 50-51 istae duae] ista duo DP 52 Gregorius] iuxta lineam add. Nota in marg. sinis. D1 uirtutes] uirtute R, uirtutem S, M corr. ex uirtutem in uentum] inuentum DP 53 notatur] nomina P ergo] etiam S 54 qui] quae D sit] fuit M, fit R 55 Sciscitabatur] suscitabatur D, sciscitabatur R, sciscitabatur S 56 in²] bis D 57 erit] erat P 58 est²] om. S in] om. M 60 dicitur] om. M 16] 20 MRS 62 per] in P 63 habet²] om. MR 5 Jo] Jo 5 P possum] possunt M 64 memetipso] memet P 67 dicuntur] uocantur P non] uero S ibi pluralitas] spatium in M, inpluralitas RS 68 est secundum¹] exp. S secundum naturalium dierum modum] secundum naturam modus P dierum] dei R, dicitur MS hoc] hic P 68-69 comparisonem] D aut D1 corr. ex contemplationem 69 aeternitas] bis S 71 aeternos] aeternitatis P 72 aeterna] om. MRS 73 apud Deum] etc M uero] nec S quae] quod MS

factum est etc. Quia uero generatio aeterna uel processio temporalis non prodesset
 75 nisi sequeretur nostra generatio spiritalis et regeneratio, ideo sequitur **propter hoc dabit eos** etc, in quo notatur expectatio populi Israelitici usque ad tempus illud quod est tempus incarnationis. Et in hoc significatur quod ex gratia Dei fuit expectatio usque ad illud tempus quo placuit Domino ut mitteret Filium unigenitum in mundum, 8 Rom: *Si Filio suo non pepercit, quomodo non cum ipso omnia*
 80 *nobis donauit?* Quasi dicere, ipsum dedit nobis et cum ipso omnia nobis donauit. Haec autem datio usque ad tempus illud non est aliud nisi ordinatio diuina qua uoluit ut desiderarent aduentum saluatoris, et desiderando clamarent, et clamando imprecarent, unde habetur Is 19: *Clamabunt ad Dominum a facie tribulantis et mittet eis saluatorem, usque ad tempus in quo parturiens pariet*. Tempus illud est
 85 plenitudo gratiae, de quo 4 Gal: *Cum uenerit plenitudo temporis, misit Deus Filium suum*, etc.

(8) In hoc autem quod dicitur **parturiens pariet**, notatur duplex generatio spiritalis in nobis: prima quae est in catechismo et baptismo, de qua dicitur **parturiens**, secunda <quae> est in regeneratione cum dicitur **pariet**. De prima 4
 P 2ra 90 Gal: *Filioli mei quos iterum parturio donec formetur in uobis | Christus*, de secunda uero ultimo Is: *Numquid parturiet terra in die una*, et sequitur *peperit Syon filios suos*. Ex his patet modus agendi in hoc euangelio, quia post generationem aeternam Christi (de qua ibi, *in principio erat Verbum*) et post temporalem (de qua ibi, *Verbum caro factum est*) subditur de baptismo et catechismo in quibus
 95 potest <nobis generari> hac generatione spiritali de qua dicitur 1 Jo ultimo: *Generatio Dei conseruat eos et malignus non tanget eos; scimus enim quod ex Deo nati sumus*. Et hoc tangitur infra, tertio: *Nisi quis renatus fuerit ex aqua et Spiritu Sancto, non intrabit in regnum caelorum*. Est iterum alia regeneratio, de qua

77-79 cf. Gal 4:4 79-80 Rom 8:32 83-84 Is 19:20b 85-86 Gal 4:4 90 Gal 4:19
 91-92 Is 66:8 96-97 1 Jo 5:18b-19a 97-98 Jo 3:5

74 etc] *om. M* uel] ut *P* prodesset] prodest *P* 75 et] uel *DPRS* 76 eos] eis *DP*
 etc] *om. M* notatur] ordinatur *S* expectatio] *om. D*, *add. D1* in *margin. dext.*, ordinatio
MRS illud] *om. P* 77 significatur] expectatur *P* 76-78 usque ad tempus ... fuit expectatio]
bis scripsit R 78 illud tempus] tempus illum *M* ut] quod *DRS* mitteret] mittit *M* 79
 quomodo] quando *DMP* non] *om. M*, uero *RS* 80 ipsum dedit] dedit eum *P* et cum] etc
R omnia nobis] nobis omnia *R* 82 aduentum] ad meritum *D*, *D1* *corr. in marg. haud legibilibiter*
 saluatoris] Christi *P* 83 imprecarent] *spatium* in *MRS*, impetrarent *P* Is 19] in ysaya *P*
 84 mittet] mittit *S* pariet] pariens *M*, *P* *aut P1* *corr. ex* parturiet illud] enim *DP* 85
 Cum] Quando *M* uenerit] uenit *MPS* 88 quae] *om. P* 90 iterum] iter *D*, ita *P* donec]
 denec *D* Christus] *om. P* secunda] secundo *M* 91 uero] *om. M* uero ultimo] ultimum
 uero *D* ultimo] dicit *P* Is] ysaya *P* terra] clam *S* 93 Christi] *om. MRS* de²] *s.s.*
D *aut D1* 94 postibi *add. Met* subditur] subdicatur *D*, subduitur *P* 95 potest] primo *MRS*,
 partum *P* nobis] *suppleui*: non *D*, *om. MPRS* generari] *suppleui*: generatur *DP*, *om. MRS*
 hac] *om. MRS* dicitur] *om. M* Io] Rom *R* 96 Dei] domini *DP* eos²] eum *DPRS*
 97 renatus] natus *S* fuerit] fuit *S* et] *om. S* 98 Sancto] *om. M* in] *om. P* cae-
 lorum] *om. D*

Mt 19: *In regeneratione cum sederit Filius hominis*, etc, et de hac agitur in fine
100 huius libri.

(9) Est ergo processus huius euangelii, in quo determinatur forma: primo de
processione aeterna et temporali ipsius Filii a Patre quod habetur in primo
capitulo; secundo de generatione spiritali quae fit in baptismo per quam fit
promotio ad <re>generationem spiritalem de qua in fine. Sed quia generatio
105 spiritalis non sufficit in adultis ad regenerationem, ideo multae sunt conditiones
intermediae de quibus agitur hic. Qui enim natus est spiritaliter indiget cibo spiritali
156ra ut proficiat sibi et sustentetur, / de quo sexto et septimo. Indiget etiam illumina-
tione spiritali ad hoc ut proficiat usque ad terminum uiae, de qua octauo et nono.
Et quia illuminatio non sufficit nisi habeat ducem, sequitur in decimo de ducatu
110 ad hoc quod perueniat ad terminum uiae: illud enim quod immediate ducit ad
terminum uiae est passio de qua agitur ab unodecimo usque ad uigesimum. Ex his
205va patet qualiter generatio spiritalis promouet / ad regenerationem spiritalem cuius
2rb exemplum datur uigesimo et uigesimo uno. /

(10) Sed notandum quod dicitur in praedicta auctoritate ubi dicitur quod
115 **parturiens pariet**: parturire cum dolore est, parere autem est cum quadam laetitia,
in quo significatur quod spiritalis generatio est cum quodam dolore sed regeneratio
est sine dolore. Et hoc notatur cum dicitur **parturiens pariet**, quod notatur Is
ultimo: *Parturiens et peperit Syon filios suos*; praesens enim generatio est cum
dolore 16 Jo: *Mulier cum parit tristitiam habet quia uenit hora eius, cum autem*
120 *peperit iam non meminit pressurae*, etc.

(11) Sic ergo habetur quis sit modus agendi in hoc euangelio, ut primo
determinetur de processione aeterna et temporali ipsius Filii, secundo de genera-
tione spiritali in nobis et regeneratione ex quibus potest derelinqui causa finalis.

99 Mt 19:28 118 Is 66:8 119-120 Jo 16:21

99 etc] *om. M* et] *om. P* agitur] Augustinus MRS 100 huius] *om. M* 101 ergo]
igitur R determinatur] determinabatur P forma] *om. MR*, formaliter P, spatium in S 102
et temporali] temporalia M post temporali add. DMRS et a Patre] bis P habetur] habet
P 103 secundo] in secundo P generatione] regeneratione P fit¹] sit D per] P aut P1
corr. ex ad fit²] sit D 104 promotio] P aut P1 corr. ex permotio <re>generationem]
generationem MSS. de qua in fine] de fine MRS post Sed add. S spatium 105 multae] *om.*
M, spatium in RS sunt conditiones] conditiones sunt DMRS 106 hic] *om. P* 107 sibi]
siue DRS, *om. M* et] *om. DRS* sustentetur] sustentur P etiam] et R, *om. M* 108 ut]
quod DS usque] et hoc DP 109 Et] *om. P* illuminatio] naturalium actio MRS 110
enim] uero M, autem RS ducit] *om. P* 111 ab] ad M uigesimum] nonum MS, sexagesi-
mum R his] *om. S* 112 regenerationem] regionem M, sed corr. ex religionem, generatio-
nem P 113 exemplum] exempla MPRS 114 quod dicitur] *om. P* 115 parturiens]
parcutiens S post pariet add. P et parturire] parturiuit D, parturie M, parturiunt P,
parturientem S est²] *om. MS* cum²] *om. R* quadam] *om. M* 117 est] *om. M*
pariet] parturiens M 118 Parturiens] parturiet D, parturiret P, partusdiens S ut vid. Syon]
om. M, s.s. S praesens enim] spatium in MRS 119 parit] peperit P 120 etc] *om. M*
121 Sic] sicut P habetur] habet MS in hoc] spatium in S ut] in M 122 et
temporali] *om. P* 122-123 generatione] regeneratione P derelinqui] delinqui P

- Nam causa finalis est ut per Filium qui est natura fiamus per adoptionem in
 125 praesenti filii Dei in gratia et in futuro in gloria. De primo 1 Jo 4: *Pater misit Filium suum saluatorem mundi; quisquis confessus fuerit quoniam Iesus est Filius Dei, et Deus in eo manet et ipse in eo.* De secundo 8 Rom: *ipse Spiritus testimonium reddit spiritui nostro quod sumus filii Dei; si autem filii, et heredes, etc.* Intentio / ergo
 S 156va est ut per generationem aeternam et temporalem perueniamus ad generationem
 130 spiritalem in praesenti et regenerationem spiritalem in futuro.
 (12) Causa uero efficiens duplex est, scilicet Spiritus Sanctus penes quem residet auctoritas, 10 Mt: *Non enim uos estis qui loquimini sed spiritus patris uestri qui loquitur in uobis.* Efficiens uero ut minister beatus Iohannes qui significatur per
 P 2va Micheam qui praedictam prophetiam edidit. / 'Micheas' enim interpretatur 'quis
 135 est iste?' et significat beati Iohannis euangelistae admirationem.
 (13) Admirabilis autem fuit in pluribus tum in uita tum in morte. In uita quantum ad contemplationem intellectus: altius enim intenuit aliis euangelistis, unde comparatur aquilae, 1 Ez: *Facies aquilae desuper ipsorum quattuor.* Aquila uero irreuerberatis oculis intuetur solem, ita / uidetur quod ipse quasi irreuerberatis
 M 111va oculis intuetur solem iustitiae cum locutus esset de generatione eius aeterna ad
 140 quam non peruenit intellectus humanus secundum se. Praeterea aquila ponit lapidem in nido ueneno resistentem ne serpens pullos aut oua tangere praesumat (secundum quod dicit Ieronimus), item in euangelio suo per totum posuit lapidem qui praecisus est de monte sine manibus (2 Dan) ut tollat uenenum haereticae
 145 prauitatis. Praeterea aquila uolat altius aliis auibus, in quo significatur contemplatio beati Iohannis qui ceteris euangelistis altius uolauit, sicut habetur ex comparatione

125-127 1 Jo 4:14-15 127-128 Rom 8:16-17 132-133 Mt 10:20 134-135 Hieronymus, *Liber interpretationis Hebraicorum nominum* (CCL 72.123). 138 Ez 1:10 138-140 Gregorius, *Moralia in Iob* 9.32 (PL 75.884). 141-142 Hieronymus, *Commentarium in Isaiam* 18.66 (PL 24.687). 144 cf. Dan 2:34

125 in¹] om. S et] om. P primo] quo R 1 Jo 4] Jo P Jo] Rom M 126 quisquis] si quos P quoniam] cuius P et] om. MRS 127 Rom] Jo S reddit] reddidit P 128 quod] quo S sumus] simus S si autem filii] om. M post etc add. D et 129 est] om. P, S s.s. 131 uero] om. M duplex est] est duplex R quem] quam PR 132 10] om. P enim uos] om. DMRS qui²] quae D, sed corr. s.s. DI 133 Iohannes] om. D sed s.s. DI qui] quae D sed corr. DI 134 qui] quae D sed corr. DI enim] ii S 135 iste] om. P 136 in²] om. M in uita] D aut DI corr. ex inuita 137 contemplationem] conceptionem RS, conceptione M intellectus] intelligere MRS intenuit] intonuit DP, om. M euangelistis] om. R, intellexit euangelia is M 138 desuper] super S 139 oculis] oculi RS quasi] qui M, om. PR irreuerberatis] irreueratis D sed add. s.s. DI -ber- 140 intuetur] intueretur DMS 141 ponit] spatium in RS 142 in nido] inuiso D, inde S ueneno] noueno P serpens] serpes D post serpens add. R ne aut] autem D 143 quod] quid M suo] om. M totum] caecum MR, S corr. ex caecum post lapidem add. S p 144 praecisus] pretiosus DP uenenum] uenum P 145 altius] altius D altius aliis] om. M significatur] signatur D 146 beati] om. M altius] altius D habetur] patet R

huius euangelii ad alia. Unde de illo potest dici quod dicit apostolus 2 <Cor>: *Nos reuelata facie Deum uidentes transformamur a claritate in claritatem tanquam a Domini Spiritu*. Unde de illo potest dici illud (Job 39): *Numquid ad praeceptum tuum eleuabitur aquila et in arduis ponet nidum suum*.

(14) Praeterea admirabilis fuit in dilectione, unde de illo dicitur 'Iohannes', 'a Deo dilectus', atque prae ceteris magis dilectus, quod significatum fuit in hoc quod cum Iohannes et Petrus currebant ad monumentum, Iohannes praecurrit citius Petro. Est iterum admirabilis in praerogatiua uirginitatis / quod significatur in hoc quod Dominus matrem suam uirgini commendauit 19 Jo, unde dicitur: *ex illa hora accepit eam discipulus in suam*. Est iterum admirabilis in morte, unde habetur et in historia sua et in prologo quod cum descenderet, imminente sibi morte, in sepulchrum, tam extraneus fuit a dolore mortis quam a corruptione carnis alienus.

(15) Sic ergo per Micheam / qui praedixit illam generationem Christi et membrorum significatur beatus Iohannes qui manifeste generationem Christi descripsit et membrorum eius. Patet ergo ex iam dictis quae causa materialis, formalis, finalis, et efficiens. Ordo uero patet in aliis.

Records of Early English Drama.

147-148 2 Cor 3:18 149-150 Job 39:27 153-154 cf. Jo 20:3-4 155-156 Jo 19:27b
156-158 cf. prologum Hieronymo ascriptum in Hugone de Sancto Caro, (*Opera omnia* [Venice, 1732], vol. 6, pp. 277vb-278vb).

147 <Cor>] *suppleui*: Cantica DP, spatium in MRS Nos] MRS om. 148 reuelata] uelata P Deum] domini D a¹] in D sed D aut DI corr. s.s. a²] ad S 148-149 a Domini Spiritu] ad diuinum spiritum P, a diuino spiritu R 150 eleuabitur] eleuatur P in] om. M arduis] arduus M suum] om. M 151-152 a Deo] adeo DR, ad eo S 152 prae ceteris] praeter ceteros D sed D aut DI corr., inter ceteros MRS significatum] signum suum MRS quod²] om. S 153 praecurrit] praecurrit P 154 praerogatiua] praeug^m D et corr. in marg. DI ut vid. sed illeg. est 154-155 significatur in hoc quod] om. S 155 quod Dominus] om. P, quod deus R 19 Jo] lucae 22 M post dicitur add. P et 156 accepit] excepit M et] om. P, scrips. sed exp. D 156-157 unde habetur ... sibi morte] om. R 157 descenderet] descendisset M, descendet S imminente] eminente DS in] et P 158 fuit] fiat MRS a¹] om. S alienus] alitus MRS 159 per] prae P 160 significatur beatus ... generationem Christi] om. R 161 iam dictis] iam M 161-162 materialis, formalis, finalis] materialis et formalis et finalis DS, materialis formalis et finalis M, finalis et formalis P 162 in aliis] add. PI etc

THE MEDITATIONES OF ALEXANDER OF ASHBY: AN EDITION*

Thomas H. Bestul

ALEXANDER of Ashby was prior of the Augustinian priory of Ashby, Northamptonshire, in the early years of the thirteenth century. According to the *Index Britanniae scriptorum* of John Bale (1495-1563), he was the author of a series of meditations, but no manuscript of the work has been known to exist.¹ Bale's entry for Alexander lists among his works 'Meditationes quasdam', found in a manuscript of Exeter College, Oxford. The incipit is given as 'Due sunt vite que in sacra scriptura plurimum commendantur'. As Bale's editor notes, no record of such a manuscript belonging to Exeter College is found in the catalogues of Thomas James (1600), E. Bernard (1697), or H. O. Coxe (1852).² Meditations with this incipit, however, but without attribution of authorship, are contained in Oxford, Worcester College Library 213, a manuscript which came into the possession of Worcester College early in the twentieth century. An edition of the meditations from this thirteenth-century manuscript is presented here. The meditations of Alexander show that he was a skillful writer of devotional prose, capable of formulating a coherent theory of contemplation grounded upon the best contemporary thinking on the subject.

1. ALEXANDER OF ASHBY

Little is known about Alexander's life. The meager factual information is summarized in Sidney Lee's article on him in the *Dictionary of National Biography* and in Josiah Cox Russell's notice in his *Dictionary of Writers of Thirteenth Century England*.³ R. W. Hunt contributes a few additional details and prints

* I am grateful to the Master and Fellows of Worcester College, Oxford, for their kind permission to publish the text here edited, and for arranging for a microfilm to be made.

¹ John Bale, *Index Britanniae scriptorum*, ed. R. L. Poole (Oxford, 1902), p. 21.

² Bale, *Index*, p. 21; for bibliographical information on these catalogues, see P. O. Kristeller, *Latin Manuscript Books before 1600*, 3rd edition (New York, 1960).

³ Sidney Lee in *DNB*, s.v.; J. C. Russell, *Dictionary of Writers of Thirteenth Century England* (*Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research*, Special Supplement 3; London, 1936), pp. 12-13; see also D. Knowles, C. N. L. Brooke, and V. C. M. London, *The Heads of Religious Houses. England and Wales. 940-1216* (Cambridge, 1972), p. 157.

valuable extracts from the manuscripts of some of his writings, none of which have been published.⁴ It is certain that Alexander was an Augustinian canon and was prior of Ashby around the turn of the thirteenth century. According to Russell, he witnessed charters dated from about 1195 to 1205, and presumably died by 1215. Hunt cites evidence that he was a papal judge-delegate at Oxford in the period 1197 to 1201.⁵

Alexander's literary remains are fairly extensive. Russell notes several extant manuscripts of a work on the art of preaching (*De artificioso modo predicandi* or *De arte predicandi*) as well as references to it in medieval library catalogues. There is also a series of sermons, a *Festivialis* containing versified saints' lives, and the *Argumenta Biblicorum*, a versification of the historical books of the Old and New Testaments. In addition, the fourteenth-century catalogue of the library of Peterborough Abbey mentions an *Instructio ad novitios* attributed to Alexander.

Alexander appears to have been conscious of the expansion of knowledge in his own time and particularly eager to advance learning in monasteries as well as in the schools and universities. In his *De artificioso modo predicandi* Alexander remarks on the increase in the number of masters of theology from the time of his youth until the present, and in the dedicatory epistle prefixed to that work he emphasizes the importance of continuing to cultivate knowledge even when one has fled the school for the cloister.⁶ Elsewhere he argues strenuously that the monastery, rather than the school, is the true home of wisdom. Alexander's *Meditationes*, while their primary purpose is to foster devotion among beginners as well as the more advanced contemplatives of the cloister, can be seen as part of a program to put these precepts into practice. The Prologue includes a learned discussion of the act of meditation based upon current Victorine theory, and the *Meditationes* themselves not only teach in some detail the traditional patristic exegesis of biblical events, but also, quite untypically for monastic ascetic writings of this time, include passages of verse from Boethius and Ovid, and an allusion to the Epistles of Horace.

Alexander of Ashby is best regarded as one of that group of learned Augustinian canons, including Alexander Nequam, Robert of Cricklade, and Peter of Cornwall, who dominated, according to Hunt, the intellectual life of England in the late twelfth and early thirteenth centuries. Hunt's suggestion that this preeminence may owe something to the inspiration of the great Augustinian foundation of St. Victor in Paris, then at the peak of its intellectual distinction, has much to commend it.⁷

⁴ R. W. Hunt, 'English Learning in the Late Twelfth Century', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 4th Ser., 19 (1936) 19-42; rpt. in *Essays in Medieval History*, ed. R. W. Southern (London, 1968), pp. 106-28.

⁵ Hunt, 'English Learning', 20, note 1.

⁶ Hunt, 'English Learning', 20, 28.

⁷ Hunt, 'English Learning', 34; for the learning of English Augustinians in the twelfth century,

In the case of the *Meditationes* of Alexander of Ashby, the direct influence of Hugh of St. Victor is unequivocal, as will be seen.

2. ALEXANDER'S OTHER DEVOTIONAL WORKS AND THE AUTHORSHIP OF THE MEDITATIONES

Alexander's previously known devotional work consists only of a brief meditation inscribed with his authorship in an early thirteenth-century manuscript, London, British Library Royal 7 D.xvii (fols. 241r-242v). This section of the manuscript has the rubric 'Alexander prior de esebi' preceding a preface of a few lines beginning 'Qui in subsequentium contemplatione nondum potest utiliter contemplari uel delectari' (fol. 241r). This is followed by the meditation itself, beginning 'Confitebor tibi domine deus', with the inscription 'Alexander ad excitandam compunctionem' and the notation 'meditacio' in the right-hand margin (fol. 241r).

In the Worcester College manuscript the meditations proper are immediately followed by the preface and meditation attributed to Alexander in the Royal manuscript (pp. 195-98), with the 'meditacio' of the Royal manuscript here more aptly titled 'oratio luctuosa', and the 'in subsequentium contemplacione' of the Royal preface given in the Worcester manuscript as 'in predictorum contemplacione', referring to the meditations which have just preceded. Bale records the incipit of the 'oratio luctuosa' as following the meditations, so it is likely that the Worcester manuscript is of the same type seen by Bale; the texts in the Royal manuscript are thus merely extracts from a much longer work. The attribution in the Royal manuscript together with the evidence of the incipit recorded by Bale leaves beyond doubt the question of Alexander's authorship of the Worcester College meditations.

3. THE MEDITATIONES: ORGANIZATION AND DESCRIPTION

Alexander's meditations have an elaborate organization. They are introduced by an 'epistola de commendatione meditacionis' (p. 150), followed by a long prologue (pp. 150-54) which includes a discussion of the active and contemplative lives and instructions on contemplation. Alexander explains that his *tractatus* has five parts (which are quite unequal in length): part 1, 'de misterio trinitatis et

see also J. C. Dickinson, *The Origins of the Austin Canons and Their Introduction into England* (London, 1950), pp. 187-92; and for a detailed study of one house, D. Postles, 'The Learning of Austin Canons: The Case of Oseney Abbey', *Nottingham Medieval Studies* 29 (1985) 32-43.

vnitatis' (pp. 154-56); part 2, 'de opere creacionis' (pp. 156-58); part 3, 'de opere redemptionis nostre' (pp. 158-89); part 4, 'de testimoniis scripturarum' (pp. 189-93); and part 5, 'de premiis iustorum' (pp. 193-95). These five parts are disposed into ten meditations: parts 1 and 2 are treated in *Meditatio* 1; part 3 is treated in *Meditationes* 2-8 and the first part of *Meditatio* 9; part 4 is treated in the second half of *Meditatio* 9; and part 5 is treated in *Meditatio* 10. Following the meditations is the 'oratio luctuosa' with its preface (pp. 195-98). Alexander explains that he has collected material suitable for facilitating meditation and contemplation. Those who are inexpert at contemplation or lack the time for it are advised to turn to the 'oratio luctuosa', which offers a good preparatory exercise for those wishing to attain the heights of contemplation. Following the 'oratio luctuosa' are two brief prayers or meditations (pp. 198-200), one of which is formed on the opening phrase of Anselm's meditation on the Last Judgment, 'Terret me vita mea'. These texts are also found in Royal 7 D.xvii (fols. 233v-234v), where they are divided into four invectiones and falsely attributed to Anselm.⁸ Although these are less certainly the work of Alexander, they are edited here for the sake of completeness, concluding as they do this section of the manuscript.⁹

In the *Epistola de commendatione meditacionis* Alexander sends the meditations, which have consoled him in a place of pilgrimage, to an unidentified 'reverend father', perhaps his abbot, who is addressed in Alexander's *Festivialis*. He states that the purpose of the work is to provoke the spirit to the joyful 'archana' of contemplation through frequent reading of it. Whoever reads the work with a pious and faithful intention will progress in compunction and devotion; and whoever is weak in faith will be strengthened by constant study of what is contained in the meditations themselves.

The *Prologus meditacionis* considers the two lives in which God is served, the active and the contemplative, using as illustrations the traditional examples of Mary and Martha and the two wives of Jacob, Leah and Rachel. Contemplatives are defined as those who are not entangled in secular affairs, but devote themselves wholly to spiritual contemplation, as, for example, theologians and the cloistered. The active are those who have charge of temporal things. In the active life, our neighbor is served; in the contemplative, God is served. Some further contrasts between the two lives are observed: one consists in labor, the other in rest; one

⁸ The same texts are also in a fifteenth-century manuscript, Cambridge, University Library Hh.4.3, fols. 95v-96v, attributed to Anselm. The incipit of the Anselmian prayer, 'Terret me domine quod tam dives', is recorded in M. W. Bloomfield, et al., *Incipits of Latin Works on the Virtues and Vices 1100-1500 A.D.* (Cambridge, Mass., 1979), no. 6000, but there is no manuscript citation, and the cross reference to no. 6001, Anselm's genuine *Meditatio* 1, is rather misleading, since only the first line of the work with the incipit recorded at no. 6000 is borrowed from Anselm.

⁹ Page 201 contains 13 lines on dreams caused by superfluity of various humors.

begins in the present and ends there, the other begins in the present and ends in the future.

In a section which seems to reveal Victorine influence, perfection is described as the state attained by the soul when, purged of all fleshly attachments and worldly cares, it burns so ardently for divine and celestial things that it receives a certain taste of spiritual sweetness. It is this sweetness which is referred to in the first verse of the Cantic of Canticles: 'Let him kiss me with the kiss of his mouth.' Instances of this virtue of contemplation are described: it was given to the prophets, enabling them to foresee the future clearly; it belonged to Moses when he saw God face to face on the mountain; it was given also to John and Paul. The moments of contemplation granted to the soul cannot last long because of the corruption of the earthly body, but this sudden contemplation is an earnest of when we will see God not as now, through a glass darkly, but face to face.

Whoever wishes to attain this sweetness of contemplation should seek to ascend the height of perfection, putting aside everything carnal and fleshly. No one, for example, can receive it who is entangled in mortal sin. Throughout the discussion of contemplation its sweetness (*dulcedo*) is emphasized. In answer to the question how one can arrive at the virtue of contemplation, Alexander stresses the importance of shunning vices, taming fleshly appetites, controlling the senses, rejecting earthly things, suspending oneself from earthly cares, longing for heavenly things, devoting oneself to prayer, and, finally, striving to comprehend invisible substances without any imagination, that is, without relying on physical images formed in the mind.

Alexander grants that the comprehension of invisible substances is exceedingly difficult. He draws distinctions between the three types of incorporeal substances which are customarily dealt with in schools, namely invisible forms, invisible causes, and invisible substances. Of these, by far the most difficult to comprehend are invisible substances. Invisible forms are such measures as quantity and size, and are the province of mathematics. Invisible causes are dealt with in physics, and consist of such qualities as heat and cold, dryness and dampness, heaviness and lightness. Invisible substances are the province of theology and consist of the divine substance, the angelic substance, and the human soul. Since forms are subject to sight, and causes to touch, they are much easier to comprehend than invisible substances, which are subject neither to the senses nor to the imagination. In these three varieties of incorporeal matters lies the contemplation of philosophers, but Alexander asserts that philosophers do not arrive at the virtue of contemplation unless they are inspired by Christ.

The contemplation of Catholics turns especially toward five matters: the mystery of the Trinity, the work of creation, the work of our salvation, the mysteries of the Scriptures, and the rewards of the just. Alexander explains that he has gathered in one volume certain things pertaining to these five topics as an aid to those wishing

to devote themselves to contemplation so that they may find the matter of contemplation readily prepared, written in a literary style designed to enkindle the spirit to devotion.

As a concession to the weakness of himself and others like him, Alexander has arranged the work in the manner of a prayer, so that those who have not yet learned to tarry long in contemplation can at least briefly consider the matter of contemplation by praying, and in the sorrowful prayer (*oratio luctuosa*) attached to the meditations, they can, through tears and lamenting, remove the stain of sin and purge the keenness of their minds, so that thus fortified they may attain the grace of contemplation.

Meditatio 1 contains the first section of the treatise, on the mystery of the Trinity and its unity. The meditation begins with a prayer requesting a foretaste of the divine sweetness and aid in contemplating the triune substance of the deity with pure keenness of mind, without relying on mental images. The manner by which the godhead can be three and one cannot be known by us, but remains a mystery. Alexander then briefly considers the equality of the three persons of the Trinity and the incarnation of the Son. What is more wonderful, he asks, than that the same person is God and man; the same woman mother and virgin? The section concludes with a contemplation of God's power, wisdom, and benevolence.

The first meditation also comprises the second division of the treatise, on the work of creation. This begins with a systematic review, beginning with the four elements and the angels, and the work of creation in six days. The seventh day, in which God rested, signifies to us that through our works we might merit eternal rest. Alexander especially considers the dignity of man, made in the image of God. He quotes the passage from Ovid's *Metamorphoses* defining man's unique position among creatures by virtue of his erect posture and a face turned toward the heavens. The fact that woman was formed from the side of the sleeping Adam is a kind of sacrament of Christ and the Church, which was, as it were, formed from the side of Christ sleeping on the cross when blood and water flowed from his side after it was pierced by the lance. The water and blood stand for the water of regeneration (baptism) and the blood of the passion (the eucharist). The first meditation concludes with a brief prologue to the third part of the tract, on the work of our redemption, which takes up the bulk of Alexander's treatise.

Meditatio 2 begins with the prophecies of the coming of Christ, and includes complete consideration of the work of John the Baptist as precursor of Christ. Alexander follows the account of John's birth and ministry as it is given in the gospel of Luke. As is typical of Alexander's style, the section includes many rhetorical questions stressing the marvels to be contemplated: 'Who might not be delighted to think and speak of those boys, and of their mothers, so excellent, so admirable?' (this edition, lines 267 ff.). The meditation ends with the story of John's sojourn in the desert and his designation of Christ as the Lamb of God.

Meditatio 3 continues this section, concentrating on Christ's nativity. The first paragraph outlines a systematic method of meditation—how sweet it will be to consider the lord's nativity from the point of view of its year, hour, place, manner, and signs. Alexander begins with the historical circumstances of the universal peace in the time of Augustus, which fulfills the Old Testament prophecy of Daniel, and the reign of Herod the alien king, which fulfills the prophecy of Jacob. Christ's birth at night rather than in the day is taken as a sign that Christ was born for those dwelling in the darkness of sin and ignorance (lines 324-326). Alexander once again seeks a taste of spiritual sweetness, to be obtained by contemplating the Virgin's ineffable sweetness. A long series of rhetorical questions follows, especially on the subject of Mary's rejoicing in the miraculous birth of her son. Alexander prays to Mary in fervent language that he may be allowed to embrace and kiss her son; and if he is not yet ready to assume a kiss from his mouth, that he may at least be allowed to kiss his hands and feet.

Alexander passes on to the nativity itself and the revelations of the birth to the shepherds and to the wise men, the one signifying the revelation to the Jews and the other to the gentiles. The birth was also revealed simultaneously in the East and the West: in the East by the angel and the new star; in the West, namely at Rome, by the springing of a fountain of oil and the collapse of the temple of eternal peace. Alexander then shows that the birth fulfills the various messianic prophecies of the Old Testament, especially those of Isaiah. The meditation ends with the circumcision of Christ, interpreted as 'the hard wound' which was borne by Christ, not out of any need to remove his own sin, but for our benefit, to show that he has renewed our nature. The day of circumcision signifies judgment day, on which we must be circumcised, that is purged from all corruption of mind and body, as in this present life we are circumcised from our sins through baptism and penance. A final appeal is made to the emotions: who would have such an iron breast that the memory of that wound might not pierce it with charity and compassion?

Meditatio 4 deals with the presentation in the temple and the visitation of the wise men, with allusions to the baptism of Christ by John the Baptist and the wedding at Cana. At the presentation, the simple offering of the two doves (lines 403-405) signifies Christ's commendation of humility and poverty. The lighted candles carried by Christians to celebrate the presentation represent the candle carried by the Virgin in her womb, that is, her son, the light of the world. The gifts of the wise men of gold, frankincense, and myrrh signify, respectively, Christ's kingship, his deity, and his humanity (lines 430-431). The day of Epiphany is triple in dignity, for on the same day of the year that the wise men presented their gifts, Christ was baptized by John at the age of thirty, and on the same day in Christ's thirty-first year, he attended the wedding at Cana and began his public ministry (lines 428-435). The fact that Christ's birth was revealed to both Jews and gentiles shows the fulfillment of the prophecy that Christ should form his church

of two walls, the Jews and the gentiles, himself being the chief cornerstone (lines 448-451). Alexander then considers in further detail Christ's baptism by John. Its significance is not that Christ needed to be purged from the taint of sin, but to show us an example of perfect humility (lines 455-464). The meditation concludes with a brief consideration of Christ's sojourn in the desert and the wedding at Cana.

Meditatio 5 considers details which Alexander had passed over in the previous meditation, namely the flight into Egypt, the slaughter of the innocents, and Christ and the doctors. When Christ entered Egypt, all the idols fell down, in fulfillment of the Old Testament messianic prophecy. The return of Christ to Israel from Egypt signifies that Christ will return to the Jews in the last days and that they will be converted (lines 512-517).

In a passage which both explains and extolls the benefits of the kind of meditation Alexander has been composing, Alexander constructs an emotional apostrophe inspired by thought of Christ's life in the flesh, lamenting the fact that he was not present to follow Christ's footsteps, to touch him, to see him, to hear him, and to see his face. Even though it is impossible for us to be with Christ in his human form, as much as we would long to do so, yet through the power of the imagination we can, in a fashion, follow his footsteps and be with him in Egypt, follow him on his return to Judea, and go with him into the temple (lines 517-523). The story of Christ and the doctors offers us an example of humility, evidence of Christ's divinity, a method of penance, and, especially, a form of obedience (lines 530-541), since Christ obeyed his parents and returned with them to Nazareth.

Alexander regrets that there are no more events of Christ's childhood which are written down in authoritative books—it would be delightful to meditate on the deeds of his youth in every detail. Yet Alexander reminds us that the Gospels do not give more incidents from Christ's childhood because God did not inspire the evangelists to record more of them. Like the evangelists, Alexander passes from Christ's twelfth year to his thirtieth, concluding the meditation with an account of the choosing of the twelve apostles and the seventy-two disciples and a brief consideration of Christ's miracles.

Meditatio 6 is devoted to the passion of Christ, and is among the most affective in style and method, as one would expect. Alexander begins by showing how Christ fulfilled in his passion the messianic Old Testament prophecies of Isaiah and Jeremiah. When Alexander considers the sufferings of Christ, he uses to the full the technique of drawing vivid mental pictures: 'I see you, Lord, afflicted with injuries, constricted by chains, cut with whips, struck down with blows, beaten with palms, stained with spittle, crowned with thorns, given vinegar to drink, fixed with nails, pierced by a lance, suspended between robbers' (lines 629-632). Alexander sorrows and suffers with Christ. Addressing Christ, he asks, 'who would not

incline to love you, who loved us so much that you washed away our sins with your own blood?' (lines 668-670). The meditation concludes with an account of Christ's appearance to Mary Magdalene after his resurrection and a listing of the ten appearances of Christ after the Resurrection and before the Ascension.

Meditatio 7 considers the events of Christ's life from the Resurrection to the Ascension, the day of Pentecost, and the early ministry of the apostles. The tongues of flame which descended at Pentecost gave the apostles three things necessary for the conversion of the world: skill in preaching, perfection in charity, and knowledge of all languages (lines 762-765). Alexander discusses his own role as a preacher and teacher in terms of these attributes. He seeks to imitate the apostles in variety of languages, which he interprets in his case as having the range of skills necessary to teach persons diverse in social class and intellectual capacity (lines 779-786). The meditation concludes with special commendations of Peter and Paul. Peter was transformed from an unlearned man to a doctor of the church, from an apostate who denied Christ to Prince of the Apostles, from a fisherman to the emperor of the world, and from a sinner to the doorkeeper of heaven. Paul after his conversion to the faith excelled in word, in deed, and in his writings and teaching.

Meditatio 8 considers the era of persecutions and martyrdoms and the spreading of the faith up to the time of the acceptance of Christianity by Constantine. The faith advanced by two methods, the teaching of Catholic doctrine and the testimonies of miracles. Alexander notes that the persecutions were turned to good, because by them the faithful were strengthened and the fame of Christ spread abroad. The meditation ends with a lament over the blindness of the Jews who rejected Christ, failing to see that he fulfills the law and the prophets. They are rightly prefigured by Cain, cursed by the Lord, and made to wander over the earth (lines 864-872).

Meditatio 9 deals with the Jews and the Saracens up to the present time. Alexander reveals his intolerance of both groups, stating that Jews and Saracens are blind because they will not grant that Christians have superior wisdom. Christians in fact excel because they have knowledge of both the Old and the New Testaments, which Jews and Saracens do not have. In addition, they have knowledge of the gentile philosophers, the seven liberal arts, and the other philosophical disciplines, with which human reason strives to comprehend invisible substances, namely God, the angels, and souls (lines 888-897; cf. prologue, lines 65-68). Alexander concedes that Jews and Saracens approve certain virtues; but where, he asks, do such virtues especially flourish, except among Christians? Where does one find such examples of perfect living? As examples of Christians who lead lives of perfect charity, Alexander points to the Cistercian monks of his day (lines 908-910).

This meditation also includes the fourth part of the treatise, on the testimonies of the Scriptures. Here Alexander observes how sweet it is to recall some of the many authoritative passages of Scripture by which the church is made secure against the assaults of the Jews and Saracens (lines 922-925), especially those relating to the Trinity. Both Old and New Testament passages are cited in support of the doctrine of the Trinity and the mystery of the Incarnation. The section concludes with Alexander's observation that both plain and obscure passages in Scripture serve a purpose. The plain passages edify the weak; the obscure passages exercise the intellects of the perfect (lines 1013-1017).

Meditatio 10 includes the fifth part of the treatise, on the rewards of the just. At the beginning of this meditation Alexander states that his contemplation will now ascend higher in order to consider the ineffable joys of heaven (lines 1028-1030). To contemplate these joys is regarded as a more advanced stage in contemplation. No human language is sufficient to describe them (note the contrast to Alexander's account of the passion, where human language and concrete imagery is employed to evoke a sense of Christ's life in the flesh). The joys of heaven will be greater than any that can be imagined on earth. The meditations conclude with Alexander's prayer that he might arrive at that eternal and blessed life (lines 1073-1074).

The *oratio luctuosa* follows the meditations, preceded by a brief prologue explaining its use. The *oratio* is intended for those who are on a lower level of spiritual progress, for those who cannot yet delight in the joys of contemplation or who lack the discipline to meditate for sustained periods of time. The *oratio* will assist in that necessary preparation if it is read frequently, along with fasting, tears, control of carnal appetites, and purging the sharpness of the mind. A person undertaking this spiritual discipline may then be prepared to attain, with God's help, the grace of contemplation.

The *oratio luctuosa* is a penitential prayer, designed to excite tears and compunction. The prayer makes use of vivid images of Christ's passion in an attempt to move the stony heart by means of emotional appeals. In its reliance on images to arouse the mind, it is directed at those in the lower grades of contemplation, for whom remorse for sin is a necessary preliminary to progress in contemplation.

The *oratio luctuosa* is followed by two short meditations on the monastic life itself. These meditations are personal in tone and remarkable for their ironic, self-deprecating attitude. The meditator is keenly aware of his failure to participate as fully as he should in the ascetic life. In the first meditation, he expresses severe unworthiness, not just in a personal sense, but, notably, in relation to a broader social context. He has failed not only himself, but his parents, neighbors, and benefactors—all those who have supported him in the hope that they would thereby be aided by his intercessory prayers. Particularly striking is his concern for the poor. He recognizes that as a religious he is supported by the labor of the poor,

and in a striking expression he confesses that if the poor were fed once a week an ordinary meal of the kind he enjoys daily, they would consider it a great blessing.

In the second meditation, the speaker laments his inability to serve God with as much devotion as he ought, especially in comparison to the ascetic practices observed by the more committed of his brethren. A rueful sense of humor at his own expense emerges unexpectedly: while others recline their bodies slightly, meditating on God even while sleeping, he falls deeply asleep as if buried in a grave; while some serve God in vigils, psalms, and spiritual songs, he falls asleep, like a pig from the herd of Epicurus ('*tanquam porcus de grege Epicuri*'). Rather than keeping God before his memory, his loins are filled with illusions and vain and foul dreams pollute him.

4. STYLE AND SOURCES

Alexander's *Meditationes* are written in the affective, fervid style characteristic of the age, a style much influenced in its development by the *Orationes sive meditationes* of Anselm of Canterbury (d. 1109), but also by his *Proslogion*, which was regarded in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries as a devotional work as much as a theological treatise.¹⁰ As noted above, one of the brief concluding meditations begins with a quotation from Anselm's *Meditatio* 1. This style of devotional writing is marked by the frequent use of rhetorical questions and apostrophes, and the medieval term that most accurately describes its form is *soliloquium*, defined as an address of a sinner to his soul or a private address of the soul to God. The stylistic and formal models for devotional writing of this type were supplied by the *Confessiones* and *Soliloquia* of Augustine and the *Synonyma* (or *Soliloquia*, as the work is called in many manuscripts) of Isidore of Seville.¹¹ Although Alexander's style is often emotionally charged, his Latin is generally graceful, pleasant, and clear in expression. The most important source of his language and ideas is, of course, the Bible, particularly the Psalms, as will be seen in the notes to the text. Alexander employs direct quotations and paraphrases, as well as weaving biblical phrases almost imperceptibly into the texture of the sentences, as is typical of devotional writing of the period.

¹⁰ The *Proslogion* is often found in devotional anthologies of the period, and extracts from it circulated separately as an independent devotional work; see T. H. Bestul, 'Devotional Writing in England between Anselm and Richard Rolle' in *Mysticism: Medieval and Modern*, ed. V. M. Lagorio (Salzburg, 1986), p. 14.

¹¹ For example, a text of Isidore's *Synonyma* with the title *Soliloquia* is found in the Royal manuscript containing the work of Alexander of Ashby mentioned above (London, British Library Royal 7 D.xvii, fol. 236v). Anselm's *Proslogion* is also sometimes given this title; see *S. Anselmi Cantuariensis archiepiscopi opera omnia*, ed. F. S. Schmitt, vol. 3 (Edinburgh, 1946), p. 122.

In addition to the Bible itself, Alexander draws on the tradition of patristic exegesis in developing his meditations. In the Prologue, he bases his discussion of the active and contemplative lives on the well-known passage from Gregory's *Homiliae in Ezechielem* (2.2:7-9) and perhaps borrows from Augustine's *Tractatus in Evangelium Iohannis* (124.5) as well.¹² In the body of the meditations, Alexander quotes passages from Augustine's *Enarrationes in Psalmos* and Gregory's *Homiliae in Evangelia*.¹³ His observations on the twelve apostles corresponding to the twelve hours of the day (lines 562-564) and his description of John at the fount of the Savior's breast (lines 978-980) may derive from Augustine's *Tractatus in Evangelium Iohannis*,¹⁴ and his accounts of the conversion of the Jews at the last day (lines 515-517) and of the seventy-two languages of the fallen world (lines 564-565) from the *De civitate Dei*.¹⁵ His explanations of the significance of the gifts of the Magi (lines 431-432) and the marvels occurring at Rome and in Egypt on the occasion of Christ's nativity (lines 359-360, 492-494) may show the influence, respectively, of the *Sermones* of Fulgentius of Ruspa and the *Historia scholastica* of Peter Comestor.¹⁶ Many of these ideas, however, were doubtless commonplace notions in Alexander's time and it may be neither possible nor accurate to ascribe them to a specific source.

Alexander quotes verses from Ovid's *Metamorphoses* (this edition, lines 167-169) and from the *De consolazione philosophiae* of Boethius (this edition, lines 140-145), and in one of the brief meditations following the 'oratio luctuosa' he wittily paraphrases a line from Horace's *Epistolae* (1.4:16; see this edition, lines 1178-1179). He also quotes twice from a 'quidam sanctus' (lines 544, 1074) and twice from a 'quidam sapiens' (lines 808, 1039). I have been unable to identify these quotations.

A primary source for the theory of contemplation outlined in the prologue is Gregory the Great, whose discussion of the two lives in the *Homiliae in Ezechielem* was the standard teaching on the subject throughout the early Middle Ages.¹⁷ At the same time, Alexander's discussion reveals the newer and equally significant influence of the pseudo-Dionysius, whose ideas on contemplation were popularized and disseminated in the second half of the twelfth century, especially in the writings of Hugh and Richard of St. Victor.¹⁸ Particularly Dionysian (and Victor-

¹² See the explanatory notes on lines 15, 29-30.

¹³ See the explanatory notes on lines 1019-1022, 1034-1038.

¹⁴ See the explanatory notes on lines 562-564, 980.

¹⁵ See the explanatory notes on lines 515, 565.

¹⁶ See the explanatory notes on lines 430-431, 359-360, 492.

¹⁷ E. C. Butler, *Western Mysticism*, 2nd edition (London, 1927; rpt. New York, 1966), pp. 171-88.

¹⁸ C. Kirchberger, *Richard of Saint-Victor. Selected Writings on Contemplation* (London, 1957), pp. 47-56; D. Luscombe, 'The Reception of the Writings of Denis the Pseudo-Areopagite into England' in *Tradition and Change: Essays in Honour of Marjorie Chibnall*, ed. D. Greenway, C. Holdsworth, and J. Sayers (Cambridge, 1985), pp. 115-43.

ine) are the notion that the soul which longs ardently after celestial things may sometimes be granted a foretaste of the supreme spiritual sweetness, and the stress on the importance of striving to contemplate the divine without relying upon images formed in the mind. Alexander's thinking on the role of the imagination in contemplation seems to owe much to the detailed treatment in Richard of St. Victor's *Benjamin minor*.¹⁹ The clearest evidence of direct Victorine influence is Alexander's borrowing from Hugh of St. Victor's *Commentarium in hierarchiam coelestem s. Dionysii areopagitae* for his definition of visible forms, invisible causes, and invisible substances, and for his explanation of the distinctions among the disciplines of mathematics, physics, and theology.²⁰

5. SIGNIFICANCE

Alexander's *Meditationes* are representative of the elaborate devotional treatises that are found from the second half of the twelfth century onward. The five-part scheme Alexander uses to give structure to his work is typical of the systematic approach to meditation that had become current, and is perhaps another sign of a debt to Hugh and Richard of St. Victor.²¹ Alexander's *Meditationes* invite comparison with such works as the *Meditativae orationes* of William of St. Thierry (d. ca. 1148), the *Scala claustralium* and the *Meditationes* of Guigo II of Chartreuse (d. 1188), and with such works written in England as the meditative parts of the *Speculum ecclesie* of Edmund of Abingdon (d. 1240), and the *Meditationes* on the Virgin of the Cistercian Stephen of Sawley (d. 1252).²² Stephen's elaborate organization is similar to Alexander's. His meditations on the

¹⁹ Richard of St. Victor, *Benjamin minor* 13-22 (PL 196.9-16).

²⁰ See the explanatory note on lines 68-72; for the early knowledge of this commentary in England, see Luscombe, 'Reception', 132-34; Alexander's borrowing may be added to the evidence gathered there. It is interesting, but probably coincidental, that the oldest manuscript of the commentary that may be of English origin, London, British Library Burney 308, was, like the Worcester College manuscript, part of the 'Bibliotheca Palmeriana' in the eighteenth century.

²¹ See E. Colledge, *The Mediaeval Mystics of England* (New York, 1961), pp. 3-55.

²² William of St. Thierry, *Meditativae orationes*, PL 180.205-248; English translation by Sister Penelope in *The Works of William of St. Thierry*, 1 (Cistercian Fathers Series 3; Spencer, Mass., 1977), pp. 77-190; Guigo of Chartreuse, *Scala claustralium*, PL 184.475-84; English translation by E. Colledge and J. Walsh of this and of the *Meditationes* in *The Ladder of Monks: A Letter on the Contemplative Life and Twelve Meditations by Guigo II* (Cistercian Studies Series 48; Kalamazoo, Mich., 1981); Edmund of Abingdon, *Speculum religiosorum* and *Speculum ecclesie*, ed. H. P. Forshaw (Auctores Britannici Medii Aevi 3; London, 1973); for the Latin text of Stephen's *Meditationes*, see A. Wilmart, 'Les méditations d'Étienne de Sallai sur les Joies de la Vierge Marie', *Revue d'ascétique et de mystique* 10 (1929) 368-415 (also in Wilmart, *Auteurs spirituels et textes dévots du Moyen Âge latin. Études d'histoire littéraire* [Paris, 1932; rpt. Paris, 1971], pp. 317-60); English trans. in *Stephen of Sawley. Treatises*, trans. J. F. O'Sullivan, ed. B. K. Lackner (Cistercian Fathers Series 36; Kalamazoo, Mich., 1984), pp. 27-62.

joys of the Virgin are divided into three groups of five each, with a 'pausatio' after the first and second groups recapitulating the thoughts of the meditator.

The heart of Alexander's treatise is the section on the work of redemption, which is by far the longest and most interesting. *Meditationes* 2-7 provide an ordered spiritual exercise on the events of the life of Christ. In his lament that there are so few authentic recorded episodes of Christ's youth, Alexander exhibits the intense twelfth- and thirteenth-century interest in the childhood of Jesus as the object of tender devotion, as found, for example, in the treatise *De Iesu puero duodenni* of Aelred of Rievaulx (d. 1167). Especially in his treatment of the passion, Alexander's technique is to intensify emotion by calling up vivid mental images with the aid of the imagination. Alexander asks his reader: 'Quomodo enim poteris non turbari, non dolere uidens dominum tuum coram te et pro te tot modis illudi, tot penis uexari?' (lines 590-591). This is a type of meditation that had a rich development later in the Middle Ages, the best known examples being the pseudo-Bonaventuran *Meditationes vitae Christi* and the *Vita Christi* of Ludolphus of Saxony, but the rudiments are found as early as the time of Aelred of Rievaulx, especially in his *De Iesu puero duodenni* and *De institutione inclusarum*, and the technique is well developed in the *Meditationes* of Stephen of Sawley.²³

Although the Prologue to the *Meditationes* stresses the need for the contemplative to transcend images and seek direct apprehension of divine things, as noted above, the method of most of these meditations is not in conflict with the principles expressed in the Prologue, but is a method offered for the benefit of beginners who have not yet attained the heights of contemplation. As Richard of St. Victor observed,

Sed quis nesciat quam sit difficile, imo quam pene impossibile mentem carnalem, et adhuc in studiis spiritualibus rudem, ad invisibilibus intelligentiam assurgere, et in illis contemplationis oculum figere? Nulla quippe novit adhuc, nisi corporalia.... Cogitat per imaginationem, quia necdum videre valet per intelligentiae puritatem.²⁴

Meditations constructed on this principle are a fitting spiritual exercise to prepare for the more advanced stages of the contemplative life, as Alexander explains in the prefatory epistle.

Alexander's *Meditationes* seem most closely related to the devotional work of his contemporary and fellow Augustinian, Alexander Nequam (1157-1217), who wrote a number of meditations of a similar kind interspersed among his commentaries on the biblical books of Solomon, as well as a Prologue discussing contem-

²³ See G. Constable, 'Twelfth-Century Spirituality and the Late Middle Ages', *Medieval and Renaissance Studies* 5 (1971) 44-50; for examples, see Aelred, *De Iesu puero duodenni* 1, *De institutione inclusarum* 31; Stephen of Sawley, *Meditatio* 3 (Wilmart, *Auteurs*, p. 342; O'Sullivan, *Stephen*, p. 32).

²⁴ Richard of St. Victor, *Benjamin minor* 14 (PL 196.10).

plation and meditation.²⁵ Both authors encourage the use of mental images as an aid to contemplation and both connect meditation with consolation. Alexander of Ashby begins his letter in commendation of meditation with the words, 'Meditationes que me consolantur in loco peregrinationis', and Alexander Nequam in the Prologue to his commentary on Proverbs speaks of refreshing the spirits of the cloistered by means of 'consolatoriis meditationibus'.²⁶ Also noteworthy is the esteem for the Cistercian order expressed by both Augustinians. Alexander of Ashby points to the White Monks as exemplifying the highest Christian virtues (lines 908-910), and Alexander Nequam has a lengthy commendation of the Cistercians in his commentary on the Song of Songs.²⁷

In two respects, Alexander's *Meditationes* are especially interesting for the light they cast on social and intellectual conditions in England at the turn of the thirteenth century. Alexander's defense of the intellectual and moral merits of Christians against Jews follows in the line of apologetic literature aimed at the Jews begun in England late in the eleventh century by Gilbert Crispin in his *Disputatio Judei et Christiani*.²⁸ R. W. Hunt has described a whole series of tracts directed against Jews written in twelfth-century England, one of them by Alexander's contemporary and fellow Augustinian, Peter of Cornwall, prior of Holy Trinity, Aldgate, from 1197 to 1221.²⁹ Hunt notes that from the second half of the twelfth century the tone of the argument became increasingly sharp.³⁰ Alexander's harsh condemnation of the Jews for their rejection of Christ is thus in keeping with the mood of his time, and his invective against their blindness in refusing to accept what their own scriptures tell them (lines 864-872) is a commonplace of these tracts.³¹

Alexander also reproaches the Muslims, grouping them with the Jews as those who stubbornly refuse to accept the superior wisdom of Christians, who alone have the knowledge of both Old and New Testaments as well as the liberal arts (lines 888-899). Alexander's care in constructing arguments against Islam as well as

²⁵ See R. W. Hunt, *The Schools and the Cloister. The Life and Writings of Alexander Nequam (1157-1217)*, ed. Margaret Gibson (Oxford, 1984), pp. 103-107.

²⁶ Oxford, Jesus College 94, fol. 59r.

²⁷ *Comm. in Cant. Cant.*, 6.14 (Oxford, Magdalen College Library 149, fol. 177r); e.g.: 'Quotiens ad hunc locum me transferro, meditationibus meis occurrit uenerabilis ordo Cisterciensium, qui nunc cum Ysaac egrediuntur in agrum ad exercitandum: nunc contemplationis dulcissime deliciis feliciter detinentur.... O commendabilis ordo qui quia labores manuum tuarum manducabis, beatus es et bene tibi erit.'

²⁸ *Gisleberti Crispini Disputatio Judei et Christiani*, ed. B. Blumenkranz (Utrecht, 1956); also in PL 159.1005-1036.

²⁹ R. W. Hunt, 'The Disputation of Peter of Cornwall against Symon the Jew' in *Studies in Medieval History Presented to Frederick Maurice Powicke*, ed. R. W. Hunt, W. A. Pantin, and R. W. Southern (Oxford, 1948), pp. 143-56.

³⁰ Hunt, 'Disputation', 147.

³¹ G. R. Evans, *The Mind of St. Bernard of Clairvaux* (Oxford, 1983), pp. 226-27.

Judaism reflects the growth of anti-Muslim polemics in the late twelfth century, inspired in part by Peter the Venerable's translation of the Koran in 1143.³² R. W. Southern notes that the rise of heresies in western Europe in the second half of the twelfth century, together with the military setbacks suffered in the Holy Land, made a difficult climate for the tolerance of Islam.³³ Although Alexander's censure of both Jews and Muslims is severe and demonstrates the general attitude of the late twelfth and early thirteenth centuries toward both groups, his criticism is tempered somewhat by his recognition that Jews and Saracens, as well as Christians, place high value on the virtues of abstinence, humility, patience, mercy, kindness, and love (lines 899-900).

The second notable quality of the *Meditationes* is their author's expression of deep concern for the poor on the eve of the introduction of the mendicant orders into England. Alexander not only commiserates with the plight of the poor, but knows that as a monk he is largely supported by their labor, and remorsefully recognizes that the poor would consider themselves decidedly fortunate to enjoy even the restricted diet demanded by his ascetic life. He asks that his prayers may help the poor obtain that divine grace through which they are able to endure poverty and hard work in this life, and through which they may find heavenly riches and eternal rest in the life hereafter (lines 1154-1159). Alexander's consciousness of the problems of poverty reflects the growing concern for the poor throughout the twelfth century, which resulted in a series of new institutions for their relief and culminated in the idealization of the condition of poverty as the highest expression of the Christian life among the new religious orders of the thirteenth century.³⁴

6. THE MANUSCRIPT

The manuscript itself has been described in detail by N. R. Ker, on whose description the following account is based.³⁵ Worcester College Library 213 is a

³² See C. J. Bishko, 'Peter the Venerable's Journey to Spain', *Studia anselmiana* 40 (1956) 163-75; Evans, *The Mind of St. Bernard*, pp. 224-30.

³³ R. W. Southern, *Western Views of Islam in the Middle Ages* (Cambridge, Mass., 1962), pp. 34-42, especially p. 38. For an example of a contemporary controversial treatise against Jews, Muslims, and heretics, see Alan of Lille, *De fide catholica*, written c. 1185-1200 (PL 210.305-430); for Alan's treatment of Jews and Muslims, see G. R. Evans, *Alan of Lille. The Frontiers of Theology in the Later Twelfth Century* (Cambridge, 1983), pp. 123-26.

³⁴ See M. Mollat, 'Les moines et les pauvres, XIe-XIIe siècles' in *Il monachesimo e la riforma ecclesiastica (1049-1122)* (Miscellanea del Centro di studi medioevali 6; Milan, 1971), 193-215; *Études sur l'histoire de la pauvreté*, ed. M. Mollat, 2 vols. (Publications de la Sorbonne, Études 8; Paris, 1974); 'Pauvreté chrétienne' in *Dictionnaire de spiritualité* (Paris, 1932-), 12.613-97, especially Part III, 'Moyen Age' (cols. 647-658), by M. Mollat.

³⁵ N. R. Ker, *Medieval Manuscripts in British Libraries*, vol. 3 (Oxford, 1983), pp. 726-32; Ker's careful description made possible the identification of authorship.

parchment codex belonging to the second half of the thirteenth century. The manuscript has 175 folios. Its size is 212 x 145 mm, the written space approximately 155 x 100 mm in 32 long lines. Two binding leaves containing polyphonic music of the second half of the thirteenth century have been removed and are bound separately as manuscript 213*. The rest of the manuscript was paginated from 1-344 in a post-medieval hand, and, following Ker, I use this form of reference in the summary description of the contents and in the presentation of the text of the *Meditationes*. Except for some annals, the table of contents, and other preliminary matter (pp. 1-22), the manuscript is uniformly written in a single, well-formed hand of the second half of the thirteenth century. As noted in Ker's description, there are several decorated initials, including one at the beginning of the 'epistola de commendatione meditationis' of the text edited here.

The Worcester manuscript is a large, complex devotional anthology of a type fairly common in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. Many of these anthologies, presumably written for private monastic use, are formed around a nucleus of Anselm's *Orationes sive Meditationes*, as is the case of the Worcester manuscript.³⁶ A summary of its principal contents follows:

1. Pseudo-Jerome, *De membris domini*, pp. 61-62, 23-32.
2. Augustine, *De trinitate* (extract from bk. 1), p. 32.
3. Extracts from penitentials; from Gratian, *Decretum*; from patristic sources on the purgation of sin, pp. 32-47.
4. Adso, *De antichristo*, pp. 48-55.
5. The letter of Christ about Sunday; prayers at mass on Christmas Eve; prayers in French and Latin, pp. 55-62.
6. Anselm, *Orationes sive meditationes*, pp. 63-149.
7. Alexander of Ashby, *Meditationes*, pp. 150-200.
8. 'Signa sompniorum de superfluitate humorum', p. 201.
9. Hours of the Holy Trinity, with the hymn 'Pater fili paraclite' (*Repertorium Hymnologicum*, ed. C. U. J. Chevalier, no. 14660, 2.300; *Analecta Hymnica*, ed. C. Blume and G. Dreves, 46:17-19); prayers to the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost; forms of absolution and confession, pp. 203-254.
10. 'Psalterium in laude sancte crucis', i.e. a hymn, 'Aue salutiferum sancte crucis lignum' (*Repertorium Hymnologicum*, no. 35721, 4.49; *Analecta Hymnica*, 35:12-25); prayers in French and Latin, mainly to the cross, pp. 254-81.

³⁶ See A. Wilmart, 'La tradition des prières de Saint Anselme. Tables et notes', *Revue bénédictine* 36 (1924) 52-71; T. H. Bestul, 'The Collection of Anselm's Prayers in British Library Cotton Vespasian D.xxvi', *Medium aevum* 47 (1978) 1-5. For an example of such an anthology from the early twelfth century, see *A Durham Book of Devotions*, ed. T. H. Bestul (Toronto Medieval Latin Texts 18; Toronto, 1987).

11. 'Psalterium beate uirginis Marie', i.e. a hymn, 'Mente concipio laudes conscribere' (*Repertorium Hymnologicum*, no. 29602, 3.374; *Analecta Hymnica*, 35:170, 153-66, 168-69); prayers in French and Latin, some in meter, mainly to the Virgin, pp. 281-319.

12. Prayers to angels, apostles, martyrs, confessors, and virgins, pp. 319-26.

13. Benedictions of Father, Son, Holy Ghost, and evangelists, pp. 326-28.

14. Lessons for each day of the week, pp. 328-29.

15. Three lessons on the Virgin for each day of the week, pp. 329-32.

16. Collects for vespers and matins, pp. 333-37.

17. Collects, commemorations, and antiphons for special seasons and occasions, pp. 338-39.

18. Instructions on the singing of mass for the king on feast days, pp. 339-40.

19. Office at first vespers (ends imperfectly), pp. 340-44.

As shown by matter written at the beginning, the manuscript was owned by the Benedictine abbey of Reading in the thirteenth century, having been received as a gift from prior Alan. Ker suggests, on the basis of internal evidence, that the book was originally written for use at Reading. In the eighteenth century, the manuscript was part of the 'Bibliotheca Palmeriana' and passed thence, through a succession of owners, into the possession of Worcester College, presumably some time after 1913.

7. EDITORIAL PRINCIPLES

The edition is made from Worcester College Library 213. I have reproduced the spelling of the manuscript and maintained the scribe's inconsistent use of initial *u* and *v*. Spellings characteristic of manuscripts of this date and place include *set* for *sed*, *michi* for *mihi*, *nichil* for *nihil*, and an intrusive *p* in such words as 'contempnere' (line 62), 'dampnatione' (line 305), and 'sompno' (lines 172, 1179); more unusual is the scribe's use of final *ht* or *hc* for the expected *th* or *ch*, as in 'Elisabeht' (lines 224, 253, 255), 'Nazareht' (lines 332, 529, 548), 'sabaoh't' (line 940), and 'Enohc' (line 516). Classical Latin spellings in *subl-* are regularly assimilated to *sull-*, as in 'sullime' (line 168), 'sullimi' (line 265), 'sullimius' (line 444), and 'sullimatam' (line 886). As is typical, the scribe is inconsistent in spellings in *ti* and *ci* in such pairs as *contemplatio* and *contemplacio*, *malitia* and *malicia*, *sacriftitum* and *sacrificium*, although spellings in *ci* predominate.

Common abbreviations are expanded without notice in conformity with the spelled-out forms of the manuscript (e.g., *set*, *michi*); since the scribe's use of *ti* and *ci* varies, I have expanded abbreviated forms of words with those letters according to the classical spelling. The scribe frequently abbreviates biblical

quotations by initial letters followed by dots, and I have expanded these according to the Vulgate text, following the spelling practices of the manuscript where possible. Small errors sometimes occur in this system of shorthand, and, where these cannot be justified by variant readings of the Vulgate text, I have corrected them and recorded the change in the textual apparatus.

An attempt has been made to follow the sentence division of the manuscript, and to a lesser extent its punctuation, but I have not hesitated to adopt modern principles in the interest of clarity or readability. The scribe is inconsistent in his use of capital letters to begin proper names, and I follow modern usage, but I retain the scribe's practice of beginning names of the deity in minuscules. Direct quotations from the Bible or the work of another are signalled by the use of quotation marks, which is, of course, editorial.

In the inscription preceding the text of the meditations I have used the Royal manuscript for Alexander's name and title; the title of the work comes from the heading of the Worcester manuscript preceding the first meditation (line 96). All divisions of the text and their titles are those of the Worcester manuscript, except in the case of the two concluding untitled meditations, for which I adopt the term 'inuetio', by which they are known in the Royal manuscript.

The Worcester manuscript is carefully written and the scribe made few mistakes, so emendations have been kept to a minimum: these are recorded in the textual apparatus. I have not, however, recorded the scribe's routine corrections of his own work. Words or letters in angle brackets <...> have been supplied by me. One word to be deleted is in square brackets [...]. I record variants (except minor orthographical variations) from London, British Library Royal 7 D.xvii (R) for parts of the text found in that manuscript.

In the source apparatus, the text of citations to the Bible and other sources is given when the correspondence in the main text is not exact. The Psalms are cited according to the Vulgate numbering.

<ALEXANDER PRIOR DE ESEBI. LIBELLUS MEDITACIONUM.>

p. 150 Incipit epistola de commendatione meditacionis.

Meditaciones que me consolantur in loco peregrinationis mee pater uenerande tibi transmittio, ut qui spirituales delicias esuris et sitis aliquem de labore meo
 5 fructum capias spirituales. Frequens huius opusculi inspectio animum tuum prouocabit ad pudicos Rachelis amplexus, ad Marie partem optimam, ad iocundissima contemplacionis archana, ad superiora arche ubi Noe collocauit aues, ad Iudee montana quo ascendit cum festinatione uirgo beata, ad tercium celum quo se raptum apostolus gloriabatur. Postremo, quociens hunc tractatum aliquis pia et
 10 fideli intentione legerit, tociens noue compunctionis uel deuocionis facile inueniet profectum. Quisquis etiam infirmus est in fide facile poterit in ea confirmari, si frequentius legere et intelligere studuerit ea que in hiis meditacionibus continentur, horum memento, hec meditare, in hiis esto.

Incipit prologus meditacionis.

15 Due sunt uite que in sacra scriptura plurimum commendantur, scilicet uita actiua et uita contemplatiua. De quibus si quis plenius instrui uoluerit, legat ea que dicuntur super illum locum in Genesy, ubi ipse due uite significantur per duas uxores Iacob, scilicet Lyam et Rachelem, et ea que dicuntur super illum locum in euuangelio, ubi eedem uite figurantur per duas sorores Lazari, scilicet per Martham
 20 et Mariam. Hee due uite sunt duo modi uiuendi quibus deo seruitur. Qui in quolibet iusto aliquatenus reperiri possunt, cum unusquisque iudex ex uera caritate insistat quandoque actioni, quandoque contemplationi, saltem in oratione cogitando celestia et desiderando. Soli tamen illi dicuntur contemplatiui, qui ab exteriori
 p. 151 administracione liberi spiritualius con/templacioni uacant, ut claustrales et theologi
 25 qui secularibus negociis nequaquam implicantur. Illi autem dicuntur actiui, quibus commissa est aliqua temporalium cura in qua deo seruiant. Illi Rachelem amplecti uel cum Maria quiescere; isti Liam regere uel cum Martha laborare dicuntur. In uita

3 loco peregrinationis: cf. Ps 118:54: 'Cantabiles mihi erant iustificationes tue in loco peregrinationis mee.' 6 Rachelis: see Gen 29:9-30. Marie partem optimam: cf. Lc 10:42: 'Maria optimam partem elegit, quae non auferetur ab ea.' 7 Noe: see Gen 7:1-3. 8 Iudee montana . . . beata: cf. Lc 1:39: 'Exsurgens autem Maria in diebus illis abiit in montana cum festinatione, in civitatem Iuda.' tercium celum: cf. 2 Cor 12:2: 'Scio hominem in Christo ante annos quatuordecim, sive in corpore nescio, sive extra corpus nescio, Deus scit, raptum huiusmodi usque ad tertium caelum.' 13 hec meditare, in hiis esto: 1 Tim 4:15. 15 Due sunt uite: the discussion here is based on Gregory, *Hom. in Ezech.* 2.2.7-12 (CCL 142.229-33; PL 76.952-55), the *locus classicus*. 18 uxores Iacob: see Gen 29:16-30. 19 sorores Lazari: see Lc 10:38-42; Jo 11:1.

actua a nobis proximo seruitur. In contemplatiua deo assistitur. Illa consistit in labore. Ista in quiete. Illa in presenti incipit et terminatur. Ista in presenti incipit et in futuro perficietur. Illa licet in quibusdam sit fructuosior; ista tamen superest securior. Perfecta autem contemplationis uirtus est qua fidelis anima, a fece carnalis concupiscentie purgata et a terrenis curis suspensa, diuinis et celestibus tam ardentem insistit, ut in eis quandam ineffabilem percipiat dulcedinem spiritualis gustus. Hec dulcedo est osculum quod in canticis canticorum sponsa petit dicens: 30 'Osculetur me osculo oris sui'. Predicta uirtute olim prophete diuine claritati aduincti, tanto inde spirituali lumine profusi sunt, ut quandoque alieni cordis occulta, quandoque longe absentia, quandoque futura manifeste possent uidere. Vnde et 'uidentes' dicebantur. Hac uirtute Moyses in monte deo assistens, non solum in mente lucem spirituales, set etiam in facie accepit corporalem, ita ut filii 40 Israel tanta claritate reuerberati in faciem eius intendere non possent. Hac uirtute Iohannes omnem creaturam transcendens purissimis contemplationis oculis in solem eternitatis defixis uidit uerbum quod in principio apud deum erat et deus erat. Hac uirtute Paulus usque ad tertium celum raptus audiuit ibi uerba ineffabilia que non licet hominibus loqui. Qui sic rapiuntur ad deitatis contemplationem non 45 possunt ibi diu morari. Reuerberati namque tanta claritate dei quia lucem habitat inaccessibilem, in contemplatione ipsius glorie uix uno momento oculos mentis apertos tenere possunt. Dum enim corpus quod corrumpitur aggrauat animam, et terrena inhabitatio deprimit sensum multa cogitantem, compelluntur statim ab illa incommutabilitate ad ista mutabilia cogitanda relabi. Set ista contemplatio momen- 50 tanea arra est quam accipimus in spe perfecte uisionis dei qua uidebimus eum non sicut nunc per speculum in enigmate, set facie ad faciem. Qui ergo ad predictam dulcedinem uel osculum pertingere uoluerit, studeat ascendere cum Moyse in montem contemplationis, in culmen perfectionis. Caueat autem in ascensu ne sit bestia uel homo, id est ne sit bestialis uel carnalis, id est ne bestialiter uiuat aut 55 aliquid de deo carnaliter sentiat. Si quis enim talis existens temere presumpserit alciora scrutari, facile poterit ignorantia et temeritate sua quasi lapidibus obrui, et

29-30 Illa in presenti . . . perficietur: cf. Augustine, *Tract. in Ioh.* 124.5: 'Tota hic agitur ista usque in huius saeculi finem, et illic inuenit finem; differtur illa complenda post huius saeculi finem, sed in futuro saeculo non habet finem' (CCL 36.685:103-105; PL 35.1974). 35 Osculetur: Cant 1:1. 38 Moyses: see Ex 19:20-25. 42 uerbum . . . deus erat: cf. Jo 1:1: 'In principio erat Verbum, et Verbum erat apud Deum, et Deus erat Verbum.'

43-44 tertium . . . loqui: cf. 2 Cor 12:2-4: 'Scio hominem in Christo ante annos quatuordecim, sive in corpore nescio, sive extra corpus nescio, Deus scit, raptum huiusmodi usque ad tertium caelum. Et scio huiusmodi hominem sive in corpore, sive extra corpus nescio, Deus scit: quoniam raptus est in paradisum: et audiuit arcana uerba, quae non licet homini loqui.' 45-46 lucem . . . inaccessibilem: cf. 1 Tim 6:16: ' . . . qui solus habet immortalitatem, et lucem inhabitat inaccessibilem: quem nullus hominum uidit, sed nec videre potest . . . ' 51 per speculum . . . faciem: cf. 1 Cor 13:12: 'Videmus nunc per speculum in aenigmate: tunc autem facie ad faciem.'

36 aduincti] (?); fortasse adiuncti

in perniciosum precipitari errorem. Predictam enim in contemplacione dulcedinem percipere non potest aliquis in mortali peccato inuolutus, nec etiam aliquis ad iusticiam nuper conuersus, cuius uulnere dolor adhuc recens est. Qualiter
60 peruenire possit quis ad uirtutem contemplationis? Qui ergo contemplationi uacare uoluerit, studeat non solum uicia abicere, set etiam carnales appetitus edomare, sensus suos continere, terrena perfecte contempnere, a terrenis curis se suspendere, celestibus inhiare, orationibus insistere, et inuisibiles substantias sine omni ymaginatione contemplari et in quantum potest comprehendere. Harum autem compre-
65 hensio difficilima est. Cum enim tria sunt incorporeorum genera in quibus philosophorum uersabatur contemplacio sicut in scolis didicisti, scilicet forme uisibiles, cause inuisibiles, et substantie inuisibiles, longe difficilius comprehenduntur substantie ille quam forme uel cause. Formas hic appellamus multitudinem et
mag/nitudinem de quibus agitur in mathematica. Cause inuisibiles sunt de quibus
70 disseritur in phisica, ut caliditas, frigiditas, humiditas, et siccitas, pondus, et leuitas. Substantie inuisibiles sunt de quibus tractatur in theologia, scilicet substantia diuina, substantia angelica, et anima humana. Cum ergo forme subiaceant uisui et cause tactui, multo facilius comprehendi possunt quam substantie inuisibiles, que nec sensui subiacent nec ymaginationi. In hiis tribus generibus incorporeorum ut
75 diximus uersabatur philosophorum contemplatio, licet illi non potuerint ad uirtutem contemplationis pertingere, nisi forte uerum sit quod aliquibus eorum diuinitus inspirata fuerit fides incarnationis Christi, sine qua numquam potuit aliquis sane mentis adultus uirtutem consequi aut salutem. Catholicorum autem contemplacio uersatur circa quinque, scilicet circa misterium trinitatis et unitatis,
80 opus creationis, opus reparacionis nostre, misteria scripturarum, et premia iustorum. Quedam ad hec pertinentia in unum collegi, ut qui contemplacioni uacare uoluerit, eo facilius in contemplationem et in amorem celestium rapiatur quo promptius materiam contemplationis inuenerit paratam et formam uerborum scriptam qua in deuocionem potuerit animus excitari. Set propter meam et mei
85 similium infirmitatem, hoc opusculum in modum orationis distinxī, ut qui in contemplacione diutius morari et utiliter delectari nondum didicit, saltem ea que contemplanda sunt breuiter orando percurrat, et in oratione luctuosa que subscripta est diutius in morando lacrimis et lamentis peccatorum suorum maculas abluat, et mentis sue aciem purget, ut huiusmodi exercicio quandoque roboratus
90 ad contemplationis gratiam pertingere possit. Tractatus autem iste quinque habet

68-72 Formas hic . . . humana: the distinctions among the disciplines of mathematics, physics, and theology are from Hugh of St. Victor, *In hierarchiam coelestem* S. Dionysii Areopagitae 1.1: 'Prima enim, id est mathematica, speculatur uisibiles rerum uisibilium formas. Secunda autem, id est physica, scrutatur inuisibiles rerum uisibilium causas. Tertia uero sola, id est theologia, contemplatur inuisibiles substantias, et inuisibilium substantiarum inuisibiles naturas' (PL 175.927-28).

57 errorem] errore MS.

p. 154

partes. Prima pars continet de misterio trinitatis et unitatis que in deo est et deus est, et de equalitate personarum, et breuiter de incarnatione / Christi. Secunda pars continet de opere creationis. Tercia de opere redemptionis nostre. Quarta de testimoniis scripturarum. Quinta de premiis iustorum. Notandum uero quod
95 libellus iste distinctus est per decem meditationes, que in margine notantur.

Incipit libellus meditationum cuius prima pars
continet de misterio trinitatis et vnitatis.
Hec est prima meditacio.

Fac me delectari in dulcedine tua domine deus, ut des michi petitiones cordis
100 mei, ut letifices me in gaudio cum uultu tuo ut merear sаци apparitione glorie tue, et interim aliquatenus pregustare multitudinem dulcedinis tue quam abscondisti timentibus te. Fac domine deus, ut experientia me doceat quam bonum et quam iocundum sit diligentibus te, pura mentis acie siue sensu corporeo et sine ymaginatione contemplari et ammirari mirabilem deitatis sue substantiam, que trina est et
105 una. Sunt enim tres persone: pater et filius et spiritus sanctus, ita quod alius pater, alius filius, alius spiritus sanctus; set non aliud, quia tres persone sunt unus deus, una substantia, una essentia, una res. Nec dubitet aliquis te esse trinum et unum, quia quomodo sis trinus et unus intelligere non potest. Modus enim ineffabilis est. Confiteor domine quia misterium trinitatis discutere, temeritas est; credere, pietas
110 est; uidere, uita et uia eterna est. Decet ut tu domine creator omnium sis trinus et unus, tam mirabilis et omni creature tam dissimilis, ut non possis de creatura tua penitus comprehendi. Set omnis creatura rationalis in cognitione tui miretur et obstupeat, et quanto amplius de te comprehenderit, tanto magis te incomprehensibilem esse perpendat. Quid mirabilius, quid dulcius, quam tam mirabilem contem-
115 plari deum nunc ut possumus in enigmate, in futuro autem facie ad faciem?

De equalitate personarum.

p. 155

In tribus autem personis nulla est prior uel melior alia, / quia tote tres persone coeterne sibi sunt et coequales. Quid dulcius quam talem contemplari deum?

De incarnatione filii.

120 Cum autem opera trinitatis inseparabilia sint, tamen nec pater factus est homo, nec spiritus sanctus factus est homo, set solus filius factus est homo. Filius dei

95 in margine: in the Worcester MS the divisions are in the main body of the text. 115 in enigmate . . . faciem: cf. 1 Cor 13:12: 'Videmus nunc per speculum in aenigmate: tunc autem facie ad faciem.'

111 possis] *corr. ex possit* MS. 112 comprehendi] *corr. ex comprehendere* MS. cognitione] -nociōne MS.

manens uerus deus factus est uerus homo, ita conceptus, ita natus, ut mater eius esset uirgo in conceptu, uirgo in partu, uirgo post partum, uirgo in perpetuum. Quid mirabilius quam quod eadem persona est deus et homo, eadem mulier mater et uirgo? Mirabilis ille, mirabilis illa. Mirabilis ille quia deus et homo. Mirabilis illa quia mater et uirgo. Quid dulcius quam talem contemplari deum, talem hominem, talem matrem, talem uirginem? Set quia nondum possum pertingere ad perfectam deitatis uisionem, fac me domine deus interim aliquam spiritualis gustus percipere dulcedinem in contemplatione tui et operum tuorum.

130 De potestate, et sapientia, et benignitate.

Dulce est michi contemplari potentiam tuam qua omnia creare potuisti, et sapientiam qua seruisti, et benignitatem qua uoluisti. Dulce est domine deus contemplari ineffabilem bonitatis tue dulcedinem, qui tam bonus es et eras, ut nolles bonum tuum solus possidere. Ideo enim creasti angelos et homines, ut eos
135 tue bonitatis et beatitudinis faceres esse participes. Tu solus eras ab eterno ante tempus, ante omnem creaturam, in te tibi tam sufficiens, ut nullo bono extrinseco indigeres. Nulla enim necessitate, nulla indigentia compulsus, set sola bonitate ductus, creasti angelos et homines, et propter eos celum et terram et omnia que in eis sunt. Vnde ille egregius philosophus tibi loquens ait:

140 O qui perpetua mundum ratione gubernas,
terrarum celique sator, qui tempus ab euo
ire iubes stabilisque manens das cuncta moueri,
p. 156 quem non externe pepulerunt / fingere cause
materie fluitantis opus uerum incita summi
145 forma carens liuore boni.

Secunda pars de opere creacionis.

Dulce est domine deus considerare quod in primo momento temporis sola uoluntate tua sine omni labore creasti quatuor elementa et angelos nouem ordinibus distinctos. Quorum quidam statim post creationem a te per superbiam
150 auersi in tanta malicia obdurati sunt, ut penitere non possint. Qui autem in bono perstiterunt ita per gratiam confirmati sunt, ut peccare nec uelint nec possint. Dulce est considerare quod de materia in principio creata septem diebus operatus es et septimo die requieuiisti, pulcre significans nos posse et debere per bone operationis senarium, id est perfectionem, mereri requiem sempiternam. Dulce est

140-145 O qui . . . boni: Boethius, *De cons. phil.* 3.met.9.1-6 (CCL 94.51-52; PL 63.758).

144 incita] insita *textus receptus*; cf. Boethius, *De cons. phil.* 3.met.9.5, CCL 94.52 145 carens liuore boni] boni liuore carens *textus receptus*; cf. Boethius, *De cons. phil.* 3.met.9.6, CCL 94.52

- 155 considerare quam pulcre ornasti terram herbis et arboribus et celum sole et luna et stellis, ut die et nocte multipliciter seruirent humane necessitati. Dulce est considerare quomodo fontes et flumina diuersis in locis terrarum produxisti, ut in usus hominum et animalium proficiant, et miro modo ad mare unde exeant reuertantur ut iterum fluant. Dulce est considerare quomodo singula elementa
- 160 propriis assignasti habitatoribus, scilicet terram ponderosis animalibus, aquam piscibus, aerem auiibus, celum angelis. Dulce est considerare quod cum de omnibus aliis dixisses 'fiant' et facta sunt, postea ut humane condicionis ostenderes dignitatem, hominem quasi cum magna prouidentia et consilio facturus dixisti: 'Faciamus hominem ad ymaginem et similitudinem nostram'. O quantam dignita-
- 165 tem, o quantum honorem pre ceteris creaturis homini diuina benignitas contulit quam ad ymaginem et similitudinem fecit:
- Pronaque cum spectent animalia cetera terram,
os homini sullime dedit celumque uidere,
iussit et erectos ad sidera tollere uultus.
- p. 157 170 Dulce est domine deus considerare / quod misso sopore in Adam de costa eius mulierem tam suauiter tam miro artificio formasti, ut nec ei sensum doloris incuteret, nec etiam eum tactus a sompno excitaret. Dulce est considerare quod mulierem non de terra ut uirum, sed de uiro formare uoluisti, ut sicut tu es unus deus caput omnium rerum, ita esset unus homo caput et principium omnium hominum, ut ex
- 175 ratione formationis humane informarentur omnes ad fidem et cultum unius dei. Ideo etiam formata est mulier de uiro, ut uir uxorem sibi matrimonio copulatam maiori affectu tamquam carnem suam diligeret et ab ipsa tanquam caput diligeretur. Quod autem de latere uiri dormientis mulier formata est magnum est sacramentum in Christo et ecclesia, que de latere Christi in cruce dormientis quodammodo
- 180 formata fuit quando forma sacramenti eius processit de latere Christi, scilicet quando lancea militis ipso latere percusso exiuit sanguis et aqua: sanguis redemptionis et aqua regenerationis. Hiis duobus modis formata est ecclesia, ut sit sponsa Christi. Nisi enim esset sanguine passionis redempta et aqua baptismatis regenerata, sponsa Christi non esset. Primis autem parentibus nostris in paradiso positis

164 Faciamus: Gen 1:26. 167-169 Pronaque . . . uultus: Ovid, *Met.* 1.84-86. 170 Adam: see Gen 2:18-23. 177 tanquam caput: cf. Eph 5:22-23: 'Mulieres uiris suis subditae sint, sicut Domino: quoniam uir caput est mulieris: sicut Christus caput est Ecclesiae: ipse, saluator corporis eius.' 178-182 Quod autem . . . formata est ecclesia: cf. Augustine, *Tract. in Ioh.* 9.10: 'Dormit Adam ut fiat Eua; moritur Christus ut fiat Ecclesia. Dormienti Adae fit Eua de latere; mortuo Christo lancea percutitur latus ut profluant sacramenta, quibus formetur ecclesia' (CCL 36.96:33-36; PL 35.1463). 178-179 magnum est . . . ecclesia: cf. Eph. 5:31-32: 'Propter hoc relinquet homo patrem et matrem suam, et adhaerebit uxori suae, et erunt duo in carne una. Sacramentum hoc magnum est, ego autem dico in Christo et in Ecclesia.'

164 quantam] quam tam MS.

- 185 benedixisti, et omnia terrena eis subiecisti ut eis omnia obedirent, si ipsi obedientiam tibi soli exhiberent; et semper uiuerent, si semper peccatum uitarent. Preceptum autem eis dedisti ut per obedientiam precepti eterne uite beatitudinem possent promereri. Fructibus paradisi in usum concessis, de uno solo precepisti ne comederent, comminando quod quocumque die ex eo comederent, morerentur.
- 190 Heu uir ille prothoplastus in ueritate non stetit, set abiit in consilio impiorum, et in uia peccatorum stetit, et in cathedra pestilentie sedit! Consilio namque serpentis et uxoris sue preceptum tuum transgrediens, se et totam progeniem suam morti et dampnacioni subiecit. / Eiecti sunt simul uir et mulier a paradisi amenitate in multiplicem presentis exilii erumpnam. Positus est ante fores paradisi gladius
- 158 cherubin flammeus et uersatilis, in quo pulcre significabatur celestis paradisi aditum
- 195 Ade et omnibus ex stirpe eius cum originali peccato nascituris per peccatum fuisse clausum, donec filius dei incarnatus, et in ligno crucis suspensus, sanguine suo ensem igneum extingueret, et sic regni celestis introitum reseraret.

Tercia pars de opere redemptionis nostre.

- 200 Hec mira et iocunda humane redemptionis gratia multiphariam multisque modis fuit in patriarchis presignata, a prophetis predicta, in lege prefigurata, a sancto Gabriele arcangelo beate uirgini nuntiata, a Iohanne baptista demonstrata, a Christo exhibita, ab apostolis predicata, in martiribus probata, et sanctorum omnium doctrine et religionis testimonio in tantam fidei lucem et gloriam
- 205 producta, ut nemo tot argumentis instructus, tanta auctoritate munitus, locum inueniat ulterius dubitandi.

Secunda meditacio.

- Multos domine Iesu Christe premisisti prophetas qui te ad redempcionem nostram uenturum predicerent. Vt autem nemo de aduentu tuo dubitaret, misisti
- 210 ad extremum Iohannem baptistam, qui te presentem digito ostenderet, quem alii prophete uenturum predixerunt. Cuius natiuitas erat tam miraculosa et uita tam sancta, ut eius testimonio omnes facile credere possent. Vnde beatus euangelista de illo ait: 'Fuit homo missus a deo cui nomen erat Iohannes. Hic uenit in testimonium, ut testimonium perhiberet de lumine et omnes crederent per illum'.

190-191 abiit . . . sedit: cf. Ps 1:1: 'Beatus vir qui non abiit in consilio impiorum, et in uia peccatorum non stetit, et in cathedra pestilentiae non sedit.' 191-195 Consilio . . . uersatilis: see Gen 3:1-24. 200 multiphariam . . . modis: cf. Hebr 1:1-2: 'Multifariam, multisque modis olim Deus loquens patribus in prophetis: novissime, diebus istis locutus est nobis in Filio . . . ' 213-214 Fuit homo . . . illum: Jo 1:6-7.

195 paradisi] parparadi MS.

- p. 159 215 Ualde notandum est quod ait, ut omnes crederent per illum. Solum namque testimonium Iohannis precursoris tui deberet sufficere ad persuadendum omnibus ut crederent. Quisquis enim eius dicta et facta, natiuitatem, uitam, et mortem attentius / considerat, de aduentu tuo, de fide incarnationis tue, dubitare non potest. Dulce est considerare quomodo nascendo, predicando, baptizando, moriendo, beatus Iohannes te precessit tanquam aurora diem, lucerna lucem, uox uerbum, preco iudicem, miles regem, precursor saluatorem, seruus dominum, paranimphus sponsum, propheta immo plus quam propheta deum. Appropinquante namque tempore incarnationis tue, Gabriel archangelus a te missus apparuit Zacharie predicens ei quod Elisabeht uxor eius sterilis pareret ei filium in senectute
- 220 sua, et nomen filii adiecit dicens: 'Et uocabis nomen eius Iohannem'. Et ut idem angelus ostenderet quam utilis et quam sanctus futurus erat puer ille, ait Zacharie: 'Et erit gaudium tibi et exultacio, et multi in natiuitate eius gaudebunt. Erit enim magnus coram domino. Vinum et siceram non bibet. Et spiritu sancto replebitur adhuc ex utero matris sue. Et multos filiorum Israel conuertet ad dominum deum
- 230 ipsorum. Et ipse precedet ante illum in spiritu et uirtute Helye'. Qui autem Zacharias uerbis angeli non credidit, obmutuit nec loqui poterat donec puero nato scriberet nomen eius dicens: 'Iohannes est nomen eius'. Sexto autem mense postquam iste angelus prenuntiauerat natiuitatem beati Iohannis, missus est idem angelus ad beatam uirginem Mariam quam insolita et singulari salutacione preuenit
- 235 dicens: 'Aue Maria gratia plena, dominus tecum: benedicta tu in mulieribus. Quod cum audisset turbata est in sermone eius et cogitabat qualis esset ista salutacio. Et ait angelus ei: Ne timeas Maria inuenisti gratiam apud deum. Ecce concipies in utero et paries filium et uocabis nomen eius Iesum. Hic erit magnus et filius altissimi uocabitur. Et dabit illi dominus sedem Dauid patris eius et regni eius non
- 240 erit finis. Dixit autem Maria ad angelum: Quomodo fiet istud, quoniam uirum non cognosco?' Quod est dicere: 'Credo quod dicis', scilicet me esse concepturam et parituram filium dei, 'set igno<ro> modum quo hoc fiet, quoniam uirum non cognosco', id est non / cognoscere propono. 'Et respondens angelus dixit ei: Spiritus sanctus superueniet in te, et uirtus altissimi obumbrabit tibi'. 'Dixit autem
- p. 160 245 Maria: Ecce ancilla domini. Fiat michi secundum uerbum tuum'. O iocundum et singulare in singulari uirgine exemplum castitatis, fidei, prudentie, et humilitatis! An non magna erat castitas eius que uirginitatem nouit, cum eam non precesserit

222 plus quam propheta: cf. Mt 11:9: 'Sed quid existis videre? prophetam? Etiam dico vobis, et plus quam prophetam.' 225 Et uocabis: Lc 1:13. 227-230 Et erit . . . Helye: Lc 1:14-17. 232 Iohannes: Lc 1:63. 235-241 Aue Maria . . . cognosco: Lc 1:28-34 (Vulg. 'Quae cum audisset'). 243-244 Et respondens . . . tibi: Lc 1:35. 244-245 Dixit autem . . . tuum: Lc 1:38.

242 ignoro] ro *supplevi*

- uoti uirginalis exemplum? An non mirum et iocundum quod tam facile credidit, tam prudenter interrogauit, tam humiliter de se sensit? Electa erat ut esset regina
 250 celi, domina mundi, et mater dei, et tamen quanto maior est, magis se humiliat dicens: 'Ecce ancilla domini'. Nec solum uerbis set etiam cogitatione et opere humilitatem exhibuit. Ipsa enim tanquam dignitatis inmemor et oblita, abiit in montana cum festinatione in ciuitatem Iude, ut Elisabeht cognate sue, grauide et senio grauate, iunior seruiet. Intrauit ergo in domum Zacharie et salutauit
 255 Elisabeht. O beatum hospitium! O beata domus quam intrauit beata uirgo gestans in utero tam beatum onus! An non decuit ut tantus hospes hospicio suo et habitantibus in eo copiosam infunderet benedictionem? Ita quidem decuit, et fecit ille quod decuit. Spiritu sancto repleuit puerum, repleuit matrem. Vnde puer, precursionis sue offitium inchoans, dominum suum quem loquendo salutare non
 260 poterat exultando salutauit. Mater uero eodem spiritu edocta, causam exultacionis intelligens, dixit: 'Benedicta tu inter mulieres, et benedictus fructus uentri tui. Et unde hoc michi ut ueniat mater domini mei ad me? Ecce enim ut facta est uox salutacionis tue in auribus meis, exultauit in gaudio infans in utero meo. Et beata que credidit, quoniam perficientur ea que dicta sunt tibi a domino'. Et quid ait
 265 beata uirgo de tam sullimi laude? Non inde se extulit, set magis humiliauit dicens: 'Magnificat anima mea dominum. Et exultauit spiritus meus in deo salutari meo. Quia respexit humilitatem ancille sue'. Quis / non delectetur cogitare et loqui de pueris istis et de matribus eorum, tam preclaris, tam mirandis? Quid mirum si mira operentur in utero, cum tam miraculose uterque conceptus sit in utero: alter enim
 270 conceptus est de sterili, alter de uirgine? Quid horum non mirum? Quid horum non mirandum? Set alterum plus altero. Magnum est miraculum quod iste de patre sene et matre annosa et sterili conceptus est, set incomparabiliter maius est quod ille sine patre operante spiritu sancto conceptus est de uirgine. Puer autem prius conceptus, prius natus est. Et cum uellent cognati eius uocare eum nomine patris
 275 sui Zachariam, respondit mater quod non Zacharias set Iohannes uocaretur. Illis ergo innuentibus patri eius quem uellet uocari eum, scripsit dicens: 'Iohannes est nomen eius', et impletus spiritu sancto, cepit loqui et prophetauit dicens: 'Benedictus dominus deus Israel quia uisitauit et fecit redemptionem plebi sue'. Hinc 'factus est timor super omnes uicinos eorum, et super omnia montana Iudee diuulgabantur
 280 omnia uerba hec. Et posuerunt omnes qui audierant in corde suo dicentes: Quis putas puer iste erit?' An non mirari poterant quod ab angelo prenuntiata fuit huius

251 Ecce ancilla: Lc 1:38. 252-253 abiit . . . Iude: cf. Lc 1:39: 'Exsurgens autem Maria in diebus illis abiit in montana cum festinatione, in ciuitatem Iuda.' 254-255 Intrauit . . . Elisabeht: cf. Lc 1:40: 'et intrauit in domum Zachariae, et salutauit Elisabeth.' 261-264 Benedicta tu . . . domino: Lc 1:42-45. 266-267 Magnificat . . . sue: Lc 1:46-48. 276 Iohannes: Lc 1:63. 277-278 Benedictus dominus: Lc 1:68. 278-281 factus est . . . erit: Lc 1:65-66.

262 ut] ubi MS. 263 gaudio infans] *abbr. transp.* MS.

pueri natiuitas et nomen? Quid de parentibus senio confectis? Quid de matre annosa et sterili? Quantum mirabantur quod pater incredulus angelo obmutuit? Quantum obstuperunt quod puer in utero exultauit? Quantum quia os quod angelus
 285 clauserat, puer ab angelo promissus reserauit? Quid hac religione gloriosius? Quid hac fide insignius qua sterilis parturit, mutus loquitur, et mater Christi et uterque parens Iohannis spiritu prophetie implentur, et tocius mundi gaudia futura preludunt? Quid mirum si mirabantur illi qui tanta miracula uidere et audire meruerunt?
 p. 162 Quid mirum si illi Iohannem / magnum fore iudicabant, qui natiuitatem eius tam
 290 magnis et tam multis miraculis fulgere uidebant? Nec fefellit eos iudicium. Ille namque antra deserti teneris sub annis ciuium turmas fugiens petiuit, ne leui saltem maculare uitam fame posset, ubi erat uestis eius cilicium de pilis camelorum, et esca eius locuste et mel siluestre. Ibi tam sancte et tam religiose conuersatus est, ut eius conuersatio fieret origo et forma tocius religionis in cautela loci, in custodia
 295 silentii, in asperitate uestis, in parcitate uictus, in abstinencia potus qui inebriare potest, in ieiuniis, in uigiliis, in orationibus, in studio sacre predicationis, et in perseuerantia bone operationis. Qui cum tante esset uirtutis ut esse Christus putaretur, respondit se non esse Christum, asseruit se non esse ecclesie sponsum, set sponsi amicum, et ei testimonium perhibuit dicens: 'Ipse est qui post me
 300 uenturus est, qui ante me factus est, cuius non sum dignus ut soluam corrigiam calciamentorum eius'. Postea uero eum quasi digito ostendens, ait circumstantibus: 'Ecce agnus dei ecce qui tollit peccata mundi', quasi dicens: 'Iste est qui per agnum in Egipto immolatum prefigurabatur'. Quia sicut sanguine illius agni liberatus est
 305 huius, liberabitur ecclesia a morte spirituali, id est a peccato et a dampnatione perpetua. Delectatus sum domine Iesu cogitare et loqui de precursoris tui natiuitate et uita et predicatione. Fac me modo cum delectacione et dilectacione procedere ad natiuitatem tuam, et in ea eo amplius delectari, quo ipsa omnibus utilior est et gloriosior.

310

Tercia meditacio.

p. 163 Tempore Augusti cesaris quo pax erat in uniuerso orbe, ebdomoda iuxta Danielis prophetiam septuagesima sexta, olimpiade autem centesima nona/gesima tertia, regnante in Iudea rege alienigena, scilicet Herode, natus es domine Iesu

292-293 uestis eius . . . siluestre: cf. Mt 3:4: 'Ipse autem Ioannes habebat vestimentum de pilis camelorum, et zonam pelliceam circa lumbos suos: esca autem eius erat locustae, et mel silvestre.'
 299 Ipse est: Jo 1:27. 302 Ecce agnus dei: Jo 1:29. 312 Danielis: see Dan 9:24-26; cf. Jerome, *Comm. in Dan.* 3.9.24 (CCL 75A.865-89; PL 25.542-53).

285 reserauit] reserat MS. 288 tanta] tam MS. 309 gloriosior] gloris- MS. 312 prophetiam] prophetam MS.

- circa mediam noctem in Bethleem Iude, et collocatus in presepio, quia non erat
 315 alius tibi locus in diuersorio. Dulce est domine considerare tue natiuitatis tempus,
 horam, locum, modum, et signa. O preclara et iocunda in hiis omnibus sapientie
 tue dispositio! Quis non diuinitus uideat procuratum fuisse, ut eo tempore quo
 uniuersus orbis erat uni principi subiectus et pax ubique florebat nascereris, tu qui
 es rex regum et dominus dominantium, uniuersitatis conditor et rector, princeps
 320 pacis, et pax nostra, qui teste apostolo fecisti utraque unum? Quis non intelligat
 tunc impletam fuisse prophetiam Iacob dicentis: 'Non auferetur sceptrum de Iuda,
 nec dux de femore eius donec ueniat qui mittendus est'? Tunc enim regnante
 Herode qui erat alienigena, non habebant Iudei regem, neque ducem de stirpe Iude.
 Set quid est domine quod in nocte potius quam in die nasci uoluisti? Certe ut
 325 maiorem peccatoribus spem et fiduciam conferres, significandum te natum esse pro
 illis qui erant in nocte, id est in tenebris uiciorum et ignorantie. Ideo psalmista de
 te ait: 'Exortum est in tenebris lumen rectis, misericors et miserator et iustus' deus.
 Quid de loco dicemus? In Bethleem natus es, ut impleretur illa prophetia: 'Tu
 Bethleem Effrata paruulus es in milibus Iuda. Ex te exiet dux qui sit dominator in
 330 Israel, et egressus eius ab initio a diebus eternitatis'. O dulcis et iocunda diuina
 dispositio, qua factum est ut nascereris domine non in domo parentum, set in uia;
 non in Nazareht unde erat mater tua, set in Bethleem, ut impleretur predicta
 prophetia! Sustine domine ut paulisper loquar cum dulcissima matre tua, ut
 loquendo de ineffabili dulcedine eius, aliquam spiritualis gustus dulcedinem, ipsa
 164 335 intercedente et te donante, / percipiam. Quis non delectetur cogitare et considerare
 dulcissima domina quanto gaudio et quanta iocunditate afficiebaris de tali filio,
 quem sine culpa concepisti, et sine dolore peperisti? Quomodo posses non gaudere
 ineffabiliter de illo qui conceptus erat in te sine semine uiri, et natus sine apercione
 uteri? Quibus affluebas deliciis in corde tuo cum pareres filium speciosum pre filiis
 340 hominum, uerum filium dei, uerum deum, et uerum hominem? Quis nouit cogitare
 quam dulciter solebas eum amplecti, quociens deosculari, cum quanta leticia
 portare, cum quanta sollicitudine nutrire? Impartire michi dulcissima domina
 aliquam guttulam de habundantia gratiarum et gaudiorum tuorum. Concede michi
 amplecti et deosculari dulcissimum filium tuum eo modo quo sponsa sua petit
 345 dicens: 'Osculetur me osculo oris sui'. Et si nondum licet michi ab ore eius

320 fecisti utraque unum: cf. Eph 2:14: 'Ipse enim est pax nostra, qui fecit utraque unum, et medium parietem maceriae solvens, inimicitias in carne sua.' 321 Non auferetur: Gen 49:10. 327 Exortum: Ps 111:4. 328-330 Tu Bethleem . . . eternitatis: Mich 5:2. 339-340 speciosum pre filiis hominum: cf. Ps 44:3: 'Speciosus forma prae filiis hominum, diffusa est gratia in labiis tuis; propterea benedixit te Deus in aeternum.' 345 Osculetur: Cant 1:1.

331 est] es MS.

osculum sumere, fac me saltem manum uel pedem eius osculari; et ego hoc loco magni muneris suscipiam. Gaudeo domine Iesu Christe et delector in te: tu auge michi gaudium et delectacionem. Quis enim non delectetur quando recolit te humanum genus tantum dilexisse, ut pro eius salute temet ipsum exinanires, 350 formam serui accipiens, in similitudinem hominum factus, et habitu inuentus ut homo? Quis de dulcedine dileccionis tue non gaudeat quando uidet te causa nostre salutis inter bouem et asinum iacentem in presepio, qui regnas super angelos in celo? Quis non miretur te uilibus inuolutum panniculis, qui celum ornas sideribus? Quis non obstupeat te suggestentem ubera, qui pascis angelos in celo et homines in 355 terra? Quis non miretur te sic humiliatum ut nos exaltares, et te paruulum factum ut nos magnificares? Vt autem nemo umquam de natiuitate tua dubitaret, reuelasti eam statim in ipsa nocte qua natus es Iudeis per / angelum, et gentibus per stellam. Reuelasti etiam natiuitatem tuam simul in oriente et occidente. In oriente per angeli tui uocem et noue stelle claritatem. In occidente, scilicet in urbe Romana, per 360 ortum fontis olei et per casum templi quod dicebatur templum pacis eternum. O quam dulce est considerare tot prophetarum oracula tunc impleta! Tunc ignis quem uiderat Moyses in rubo sine rubi lesione exiuit de rubo. Tunc pluuia quam uiderat Dauid sicut sine uelleris corruptione de celo descenderat in uellus, ita sine eiusdem lesione descendit de uellere super terram. Tunc impleta est illa prophetia Ysaie: 365 'Puer natus est nobis, et filius datus est nobis, et factus est principatus super humerum eius, et uocabitur nomen eius admirabilis, consiliarius, deus fortis, pater futuri seculi, princeps pacis'. Tunc processit de uirga flos ille pulcherimus de quo ait Ysaias: 'Egredietur uirga de radice Iesse et flos de radice eius ascendet'. Tunc iuxta Danielis prophetiam abscissus est lapis de monte sine manu hominis, id est 370 Christus natus est de excellentissima uirgine Maria sine opere humane generatio-

346-347 hoc loco magni muneris suscipiam: 'I will receive this in place of a great reward.' 349-351 temet ipsum . . . homo: cf. Phil 2:7: 'sed semetipsum exinanivit formam serui accipiens, in similitudinem hominum factus, et habitu inuentus ut homo.' 352 inter bouem . . . presepio: seen as the fulfillment of Is 1:3: 'Cognovit bos possessorem suum, et asinus praesepe domini sui'; see Peter Comestor, *Historia scholastica: in euangelia* 5 (PL 198.1540). qui regnas super angelos: see Hebr 1:5-8. 356-357 Vt autem . . . stellam: on the revelation to the Jews and Gentiles, see Fulgentius of Ruspa, *Serm.* 4.2 (CCL 91A.911-12; PL 65.733). 359-360 per ortum fontis olei et per casum templi: on the fountain of oil and the fall of the temple, see Peter Comestor, *Historia scholastica: in euangelia* 5 (PL 198.1540). The fountain of oil derives from Orosius, *Historiae aduersus paganos* 6.20 (CSEL 5.418-21). 362 Moyses: cf. Ex 3:2: 'Apparuitque ei Dominus in flamma ignis de medio rubi: et uidebat quod rubus arderet, et non combureretur.' 362-363 pluuia quam uiderat Dauid: the correct allusion is not to David, but to Gedeon: see Jud 6:36-40. 365-367 Puer natus . . . pacis: Is 9:6 (Vulg. 'Parvulus enim natus', etc.). 368 Egredietur: Is 11:1. 369 Danielis prophetiam . . . hominis: cf. Dan 2:34: 'Videbas ita, donec abscissus est lapis de monte sine manibus, et percussit statuam in pedibus eius, ferreis et fictilibus, et comminuit eos.'

366 uocabitur] o. add. MS. (*abbr. superflua*)

nis. Tunc mulier nouo et miro modo peperit illum qui simul erat puer et uir: puer corpore, uir mente; puer statura, uir sapientia. Vnde Ieremias ait: 'Nouum faciet dominus super terram. Mulier circumdabit uirum'. Quis de hac nouitate non gaudeat, cui non pariat hec nouitas lecticiam nouam, nisi forte illi qui nondum
 375 nouit ueterem hominem exuere et nouum induere? Iam impleta est illa dulcissima prophetia quam sapientissimus ille Salomon in persona ecclesie protulit dicens: 'Quis michi det te fratrem meum suggestentem ubera matris mee, ut inueniam te foris, et deosculer, et iam me nemo despiciat?' Ecce domine Iesu iam factus es frater
 380 noster per nature nostre assumptionem. Iam sugxisti ubera matris nostre, id est beate uirginis Marie, que est mater et domina tocius ecclesie. Iam inuentus es foris,
 166 id est in carne / uisibilis, qui prius quasi intus latebas clausus in sinu patris. Iam multi deosculantur te, id est tibi coniunguntur, et vniuntur dulcedine caritatis, que per osculum significatur. Fac me domine Iesu sic deosculari te, ut cum tanta familiaritate tibi coniunctus fuero, me nec boni angeli nec mali despiciant, set boni
 385 ament et custodiant, et mali timeant et fugiant. Celebrato natiuitatis tue gaudio, iocundum est michi domine Iesu considerare quod cum circumcisionis remedio non indigeres quia immunis eras ab omni peccato, dignatus es tamen die octaua a natiuitate tua illud durum uulnus in tenera carne tua suscipere, nulla tui necessitate, set causa utilitatis nostre, scilicet ut ostenderes in te naturam nostram esse
 390 innouandam, ut significares nos in die octaua, id est in die iudicii qui septenario presentis uite succedet, esse circumcidendos, id est purgandos ab omni corruptione mentis et corporis, si in presenti a peccatis per baptismum siue per penitentiam circumcisi fuerimus. Quis tam durus ut non possit tibi compati quando recordatur quod illud durum uulnus intuitu nostre salutis suscepisti? Quis tam ferreum pectus
 395 habet, ut illud huius uulneris memoria uulnerare nequeat caritate uel compassione?

Quarta meditatio.

Die tricesimo secundo post circumcisionem tuam eras domine Iesu in templum delatus et cum hostiis legalibus deo patri oblatus. O quam sollicite cogitandum, quam memoriter tenendum, quod prius eras circumcisis et postea in templum
 400 delatus! Per hoc enim pulcre significasti quod oportet nos prius a uiciis circumcidi, si postmodum uoluerimus, scilicet post hanc uitam, in templum superne Ierusalem cum hostiis meritorum transferri. Set quid est domine quod non est oblata pro te

372 Nouum faciet: Jer 31:22. 375 nouit ueterem . . . induere: cf. Eph 4:22-24: 'deponere vos secundum pristinam conversationem ueterem hominem, qui corrumpitur secundum desideria erroris. Renouamini autem spiritu mentis uestrae, et induite novum hominem, qui secundum Deum creatus est in iustitia, et sanctitate ueritatis.' 377 Quis michi: Cant 8:1. 397 templum: see Lc 2:22-24.

376 quam] quem MS. 395 ut] ud MS. *fortasse recte, uelut sed/set*

- p. 167 hostia diuitum, scilicet ag/nus, set hostia pauperum, scilicet par turturum siue duo
 pulli columbarum? Commendas in hoc sicut in multis aliis paupertatem et
 405 humilitatem. Nosti enim domine quod nichil est quod miseros mortales magis
 retrahat a uia salutis quam elatio superbie et amor pecunie. Ut ergo humanum
 genus a superbia et auaritia deterres, et ad amorem paupertatis et humilitatis
 inuitares, paupertatem uerbo et exemplo multipliciter commendasti. Ideo humi-
 liasti et exinanisti temet ipsum formam serui accipiens. Ideo tibi elegisti pauperem
 410 matrem, pauperem natiuitatis locum, pauperes discipulos. Ideo tantam elegisti tibi
 paupertatem, ut non haberes hospicium proprium ubi caput tuum reclinares. Fac
 me domine Ihesu imitari te amore paupertatis et humilitatis in presenti, ut merear
 in futuro exaltari, et ditari bonis ineffabilibus et diuiciis eternis. Fac me imitari illum
 beatum Symeonem, qui cum ineffabili gaudio suscipiens te in ulnas ait: 'Nunc
 415 dimittis domine seruum tuum in pace. Quia uiderunt oculi mei salutare tuum'. Da
 michi domine lumen et pacem. Da lumen fidei michi. Da pacem requiei. Fac me
 domine uirtutes illas habere que per hostiam pro te oblatam significate sunt, scilicet
 castitatem et innocentiam. Per turturem enim significata est castitas, per columbam
 innocentia. Digne in sacrificium potest offerri cum hiis duabus uirtutibus quilibet:
 420 sine hiis, nemo. Dulce est domine cum predictis considerare quomodo per
 uniuersum orbem Christiani presentationem tuam in templo factam representantes
 portant in manibus candelas accensas, sicut beata uirgo mater tua portauit candela-
 lam suam, scilicet te filium suum, qui es lux uera illuminans omnem hominem
 uenientem in hunc mundum. Ideo uocauit te beatus Symeon: 'Lumen ad reuelatio-
 425 nem gentium et gloriam plebis tue Israel'. Fac me domine ad imitationem beate
 p. 168 virginis / matris tue et sancti Symeonis portare te in corde meo per firmam fidem,
 et in manibus per bonam operationem. Quid agis o anima mea? Quo progredere-
 ris? Visne preterire sacratissimam epiphanie diem triplici dignitate et multiplici
 sacramento insignitam? Eadem die tres magi preuio noui sideris fulgore in
 430 Bethlehem perducti Christum adorauerunt, offerentes ei munera, et eisdem muner-

403-404 hostia diuitum . . . columbarum: cf. Lev 12:8: 'Quod si non invenerit manus eius, nec potuerit offerre agnum, sumet duos turtures vel duos pullos columbarum, unum in holocaustum, et alterum pro peccato; orabitque pro ea sacerdos, et sic mundabitur.' 409 exinanisti . . . accipiens: cf. Phil 2:7: 'sed semetipsum exinanivit formam servi accipiens, in similitudinem hominum factus, et habitu inventus ut homo.' 411 haberes hospicium . . . reclinares: cf. Mt 8:20: 'Filius autem hominis non habet ubi caput reclinet'; see also Lc 9:58. 414-415 Nunc dimittis: Lc 2:29. 423-424 lux uera . . . mundum: cf. Jo 1:9: 'Erat lux vera, quae illuminat omnem hominem uenientem in hunc mundum.' 424 Lumen: Lc 2:32. 428 triplici dignitate: although in the West the Feast of the Epiphany principally celebrated the Adoration of the Magi, the Baptism of Christ and the Miracle at Cana were also commemorated, all three of which were held to have occurred on the same day of the year; see Rabanus Maurus, *De clericorum institutione* 2.32 (PL 107.344).

429 tres] quatuor MS.; *solis tribus donis tamen refert auctor in lineis sqq.*

bus fidem suam protestantes, scilicet in auro regem, in thure deum, in mirra hominem mortalem et pro hominum salute moriturum. Eadem die set anno a natiuitate tricesimo erat Christus a Iohanne in Iordane baptizatus. Eadem die set anno tricesimo primo intererat Iesus nuptiis in Chana Galilee, ubi deficiente uino
 435 aquam in uinum conuertit. Conuertere anima mea in requiem tuam. Reuertere ad beatum puerum in cunis tibi uagientem, in stella tibi arridentem. Non aliis intendas, non citius recedas. In eius consideratione morare, et mirare de creatura sua creatorem procreatum, de riualo suo fontem magnum exortum, de ramo suo radicem omnium bonorum natam, de palmitis suo uitam ueram productam, de filia
 440 sua patrem progenitum. Procide cum magis ante pedes eius, illum corde adora, muneribus honora. Honora eum in auro per fidei sapientiam, in thure per orationis deuotionem, in myrra per carnis mortificationem. Vnde dulcior meditacio? Vnde iocundior contemplatio? Vbi preclarius edificacio? In hiis ergo morare diutius, meditare attentius, delectare suauius, ascende sullimius, speculari subtilius, ora
 445 instantius, adora deuocius, adora cum magis in carne uerbum, in infantia sapientiam, in infirmitate uirtutem, et in hominis ueritate dominum maiestatis. Vt autem profectius iocunderis, uide quam pulcre, quam decenter diuinitus procuratum est
 . 169 / ut pastores in Iudea per angelum moniti, et magi in Caldea per stellam moti ad Christum uenirent adorandum, ut ipse Christus hinc primitias gentium, inde
 450 Iudeorum tanquam duos parietes in se ipso angulari lapide tunc coniungere inciperet, ut ex illis duobus una ecclesia construeretur. Tunc cepit impleri prophetia illa: 'Populus gentium qui ambulabat in tenebris uidit lucem magnam, habitantibus in regione umbre mortis lux orta est eis'. Item: 'Ambulabunt gentes in lumine tuo, et reges in splendore ortus tui'. Christum quem miraris anima mea per stellam
 455 magis manifestatum, mirare in Iordane a Iohanne baptizatum, non ut ille qui sine peccato erat tactu aquarum purgaretur, set ut tactu suo aquas purgaret et in lauacrum nobis consecraret. Uide quam breuiter, quam egregie beatus Iohannes uidens Iesum ad se uenientem descripserit eius passionem, natiuitatem, dignitatem, et diuinitatem. Ait enim: 'Ecce agnus dei, ecce qui tollit peccata mundi. Hic est
 460 de quo dixi. Post me uenit uir qui ante me factus est', id est michi prelatum est

431-432 in auro . . . moriturum: this is the standard interpretation of the three gifts; see Irenaeus, *Adversus haereses* 3.9 (PG 7.870); Leo the Great, *Serm.* 36.1 (CCL 138.196; PL 54.254); Fulgentius of Ruspa, *Serm.* 4.9 (CCL 91A.915-16; PL 65.736). 450 duos parietes in se ipso: cf. Eph 2:14: 'qui fecit utraque unum, et medium parietem maceriae soluens.' angulari lapide: cf. Ps 117:22: 'Lapidem quem reprobauerunt aedificantes, hic factus est in caput anguli'; Mt 21:42: 'Dicit illis Iesus: Nunquam legistis in Scripturis: Lapidem quem reprobauerunt aedificantes, hic factus est in caput anguli? A Domino factum est istud, et est mirabile in oculis nostris'; Eph 2:20: 'superaedificati super fundamentum apostolorum, et prophetarum, ipso summo angulari lapide Christo Iesu'; see also Act 4:11; for the association of the shepherds and the Magi with Christ's building the church of two walls, the Jews and the Gentiles, see Augustine, *Serm.* 201.1 (PL 37.1031); Fulgentius of Ruspa, *Serm.* 4.2-3 (CCL 91A.911-12; PL 65.733). 452 Populus: Is 9:2. 453 Ambulabunt: Is 60:3. 459-461 Ecce agnus dei . . . quia prior me erat: Jo 1:29-30.

dignitate, 'quia prior me erat' diuinitate. Vide in domino et in seruo perfecte humilitatis exemplum. An non erat mira humilitas domini quod uoluit a seruo baptizari, quod illud caput angelicis potestatibus tremendum manibus serui sui inclinauit ut aqua intingeretur? An non erat mira humilitas Iohannis, qui cum sciret
 465 se precursorem domini et baptistam eius destinatum, tamen memor fragilitatis sue contremuit, et sanctum dei uerticem tangere non audebat? Quid enim ait? 'Ego a te debeo baptizari, et tu uenis ad me?' Set quia uera est illa humilitas quam comes obedientia non deserit, offitium quod prius repulit humiliter, postea deuote impleuit, cum dominus ei dixisset: 'Sine modo. Sic enim decet nos implere omnem
 p. 170 470 iusticiam'. Vide adhuc quomodo in bap/tismo Christi ostensa est mirabiliter tota trinitas, scilicet pater in uoce, filius in homine, spiritus sanctus in columba. Vide qualiter Christo baptizato celi dicuntur fuisse aperti. Vide quare Christus statim post baptismi percepcionem secessit in desertum, ubi quadraginta diebus et quadraginta noctibus ieiunauit, ubi eum malignus spiritus de tribus uiciis quibus
 475 Adam temptando deuicerat temptauit, et uictus confususque discessit. Noli anima mea dimittere hic dominum tuum, set sequere eum usque ad nuptias, ubi uino deficiente ex aqua fecit uinum nouum. Vide quod per nuptias illas significatur coniunctio Christi et ecclesie, per quam defecit uinum uetus, id est cessauit carnalis obseruantia legis, et lex que prius solebat carnaliter obseruari in spiritualem
 480 intellectum conuersa est. Nos quoque de uita ueteris hominis insipida et frigida translati sumus per eandem coniunctionem Christi et ecclesie ad uitam sapidam et calidam: sapidam fide, calidam caritate. Ecce omnia sunt hec plena misteriiis, plena documentis. Domine Iesu Christe qui in predicta die dignatus es magis per stellam manifestari, et in Iordane baptizari, et aquam in uinum mutare potentia
 485 mirabili: illumina me per stellam, id est per splendorem gratie; laua me baptismo penitentie; et propina michi uinum spiritualis intelligentie.

Quinta meditacio.

Dulce est michi domine ad memoriam reuocare quod superius omisi, scilicet quod non longe post diem epiphanie apparuit angelus in sompnis Ioseph dicens:
 490 'Surge et accipe puerum et matrem eius, et fuge in Egiptum, et esto ibi usque dum dicam tibi. Futurum est enim ut Herodes querat puerum ad perdendum eum'. Te autem intrante in Egiptum corruerunt omnia ydola que ibi colebantur, ita ut etiam

466-467 Ego a te: Mt 3:14. 469 Sine modo: Mt 3:15. 490 Surge et accipe: Mt 2:13.
 492 corruerunt omnia ydola: for the fall of the idols on Christ's entry into Egypt as the fulfillment of Is 19:1, see Peter Comestor, *Historia scholastica: in euangelia* 10: 'Cumque ingrederetur Dominus in Aegyptum, corruerunt idola Aegypti, secundum Isaiam, qui ait: "Ascendet . . ."' (PL 198.1543).

468 obedientia] -tiam ms. 475 deuicerat] -eret ms.

- s. 171 ad litteram uideretur impleri pro/phetia illa: 'Ascendet dominus super nubem
 leuem, et ingredietur Egiptum, et commouebuntur simulachra Egipti'. Decens
 495 enim erat ut quo ueritas uenit, ibi falsitas stare non posset. Set quare uoluisti
 domine inimicum tuum fugere, cum sis omnipotens, scilicet cum posses eum solo
 nutu in abissum precipitare? O pium exemplum! O dulce infirmitati nostre
 solatium! Sciebas domine futurum esse quod fideles tui quandoque persecutores
 suos fugerent. Volens ergo tempus passioni tue congruum expectare, fugiebas
 500 inimicum tuum, ne membris tuis si se quandoque consimili fuga tuerentur imputa-
 retur ad culpam quod in capite precessit ad cautelam. Licet enim persecucionem
 fugere ubi fides per fugam non periclitatur. Inde est quod tuis dixisti: 'Si uos
 persecuti fuerunt in una ciuitate, fugite in aliam'. Interim domine dum <eras> in
 505 in Egipto, Herodes ut te occideret, occidit omnes pueros qui erant in Bethleem, et
 in omnibus finibus eius, a bimatu et infra. Licet autem pueri nondum potuerint
 credere, aut intelligere, aut uoluntatem paciendi habere, tamen quia causa tui
 nominis cesi sunt, sociasti eos non solum numero saluandorum, set etiam numero
 sanctorum, ut non solum sibi salutem inueniant, set etiam aliis salutem impetrare
 possint. O magna pietatis tue miseratio! O mira benignitatis tue munificentia! O
 510 quantum spei et fiducie! O quantum certitudinis de premio futuro confert huius
 munificentie consideratio illis qui se pro tui nominis honore martirio corporali uel
 spirituali spontanea uoluntate tradunt! Mortuo autem Herode, regressus es ab
 Egipto in Iudeam, ut etiam situ corporis significares quia tu qui Iudeos propter
 p. 172 perfidiam suam relinquens ad gentes per fidei tue noticiam tanquam in / Egiptum
 515 transieras, reuersurus es circa finem mundi ad Iudeos, extincta malitia eorum qui
 modo contra Christianos seuiunt, quando predicantibus Elya et Enohc fidem tuam
 sunt suscepturi. Felices illi domine quibus datum est te pedibus sequi, manibus
 tangere, brachiis amplecti, oculis uidere, auribus audire, et ore ad os tecum loqui.
 Heu michi quod non affui, quod te non uidi, quod non potui pedes tuos deosculari,
 520 faciem tuam uidere, uerba tua audire; set gratias tibi domine quod non potui tunc
 pede corporis, possum modo pede cogitacionis, motu mentis, passibus fidei et
 dilectionis. Ecce enim sic paulo ante tecum fui in Egipto, tecum reuersus sum in
 Iudeam, et tecum iam ascendam in templum. Dulce est namque michi considerare
 quod cum puer esses duodennis cum parentibus tuis in die festo in templum in
 525 Ierusalem ascendeabas, ubi a parentibus tuis amissus et sollicite quesitus, post
 triduum inuentus es in templo sedens in medio doctorum, audiens illos et interro-

493 Ascendet: Is 19:1. 502 Si uos: cf. Mt 10:23. 504-505 Herodes ut te occideret. . . infra:
 cf. Mt 2:16: 'Tunc Herodes uidens quoniam illusus esset a Magis, iratus est valde, et mittens
 occidit omnes pueros, qui erant in Bethlehem, et in omnibus finibus eius, a bimatu et infra . . .'
 515 reuersurus es: on the conversion of the Jews, see Augustine, *De civ. Dei* 20.29 (CCL 48.752-53;
 PL 41.703-704). 524 puer esses duodennis: see Lc 2:41-51. 525-527 post triduum . . .
 interrogans: cf. Lc 2:46: 'Et factum est, post triduum invenerunt illum in templo sedentem in medio
 doctorum, audientem illos, et interrogantem eos.'

- gans. Et omnes mirabantur super prudentia et responsis tuis. Set cum non adquiescerent parentes tui ut ibi diutius remaneres, obedisti eorum uoluntati, sequens eos in Nazareht et eras subditus illis. Omnis tua actio domine nostra est
- 530 lectio. Ecce hoc in opere tuo multiplex nobis arridet doctrina, scilicet humilitatis exemplum, diuinitatis tue indicium, penitentie modus, et obedientie forma. Humilitatis erat opus quod tu sicut uerus homo cum hominibus in templum ascendeabas ad offerenda deo munera et sacrificia, ut legem quam dedisti seruans, alios ad legis obseruationem inuitares. Diuinitatis tue erat indicium quod doctores
- p. 173 535 tam subtiliter interrogabas et tam sapienter respondebas, ut omnes obstupescerent qui te audiebant. Uoluisti autem a parentibus tuis queri et post triduum inueniri, ut doceres illos qui te criminaliter peccando amisissent querere te per triduum, id est tribus modis, scilicet compunctione, confessione, et satisfaccione. Super omnia autem notanda est forma obedientie quam nobis tradidisti obediendo fabro et
- 540 femine, ut unusquisque pro tui amore et honore deuote obediret prelato suo, quamuis inferiori genere aut sapientia aut uirtute. O quam diligenter est considerandum, quam memoriter tenendum quod ait euangelista de obedientia tua: 'Et erat', inquit, 'subditus illis'. O uerbum filiis obedientie iocundum, memoria dignum, dulcedine plenum! De hac obedientia tua quidam sanctus elegantissime
- 545 loquens ait: 'Non legistis in euangelio quam formam obediendi puer Iesus pueris suis tradiderit? Nam cum remansisset in Ierusalem et dixisset in hiis que patris sui erant oporteret se esse, non adquiescentibus parentibus eius ut ibi remaneret, sequi illos in Nazareht non desepxit, magister discipulos, deus homines, uirtus et sapientia fabrum et feminam'. Quid etiam addit sacra historia? 'Et erat', inquit,
- 550 'subditus illis'. Quousque eritis uos sapientes in oculis uestris? Dulce esset michi domine Iesu amplius scire de gestis pueritie tue, si amplius in libris autenticis inueniretur. Dulce esset michi scire quomodo solebas in pueritia tua te habere, quomodo sedere, quomodo stare, quomodo incedere, quid loqui, quid agere. Certissimum
- p. 174 555 tamen michi est quod tu qui sine peccato eras te in omnibus hiis honestissime habebas. Set quare non scripserunt euangeliste aliquid amplius de gestis puericie tue? Quia non inspirasti eis ut amplius scriberent. Voluisti ut ea que / scripta sunt scriberent et non plura. Sufficit ergo michi uoluntas tua, qua bene uis quicquid uis. Transibo cum euuangelista de duodecimo anno tuo ad tricesimum. Noluisti
- 560 domine ante tricesimum annum publice predicare, ut precipites animos reprimeres, ne quis ante maturitatem etatis aut mentis offitium predicationis aut culmen

527 Et omnes . . . responsis tuis: cf. Lc 2:47: 'Stupebant autem omnes qui eum audiebant, super prudentia et responsis eius.' 542-543 Et erat: Lc 2:51. 544 quidam sanctus: unidentified. 549 Et erat: Lc 2:51.

537 te¹] de ms.

regiminis suscipere presumeret. Vt autem ostenderes uerum diem, ueram lucem mundi, elegisti duodecim apostolos tanquam duodecim horas diei quibus totum mundum illuminares. Preterea ut declarares te [te] esse dominum totius mundi qui
 565 per linguas septuaginta duas erat diuisus, elegisti totidem discipulos, et misisti illos binos ante faciem tuam in omnem ciuitatem et locum quo eras ipse uenturus. Doctrinam tuam esse ueram, opera tua miraculosa probabant. Dedisti enim cecis uisum, claudis gressum, surdis auditum, mutis loquelam, leprosis mundiciam, et mortuis uitam. Suscitasti enim filiam archisynagogi in domo, filium uidue extra
 570 portam, et Lazarum quatruiduanum in sepulcro. Tunc manifestissime impleta fuit illa prophetia: 'Deus ipse ueniet et saluabit nos. Tunc aperientur oculi cecorum, et aures surdorum patebunt. Tunc sicut ceruus saliet claudus, et aperta erit lingua mutorum'. Dulce est cum predictis considerare quod a multis demonia eiecisti, quod de quinque panibus quinque milia hominum saciasti, quod supra mare
 575 ambulasti et Petro ut hoc faceret prestitisti, quod predixisti Petro quod in ore piscis staterem inueniret. Quod ipse te ter erat negaturus. Quod illis qui preparaturi erant tibi pascha occurreret homo lagenam aque ferens. Quod secuturi eum inuenirent cenaculum grande stratum ubi pararent tibi pascha. / Quod predixisti passionem
 175 tuam et resurrectionem tuam. De passione tua loquens dixisti: 'Sicut Moyses exaltauit serpentem in deserto, ita exaltari oportet filium hominis, ut omnis qui credit in illum non pereat, set habeat uitam eternam'. Et rursum: 'Cum exaltatus fuero a terra, omnia traham ad me ipsum'. Vt autem passionis tue penam et resurrectionis tue gloriam manifestissime declarares, assumpsisti discipulos tuos secreto dicens illis: 'Ecce ascendimus Iherosolimam, et filius hominis tradetur
 580 principibus sacerdotum et scribis, et condempnabunt eum morte. Et tradent eum gentibus ad deludendum et flagellandum et crucifigendum, et tertia die resurget'.

562-564 Vt autem . . . illuminares: cf. Augustine, *Tract. in Ioh.* 49.8: 'Quia ut diem se esse ostenderet, duodecim discipulos elegit. Si ego sum, inquit, dies, et uos horae, numquid horae diei consilium dant?' (CCL 36.424:46-48; PL 35.1750). 563 elegisti duodecim apostolos: see Mt 10:1-4; Mc 3:13-19; Lc 6:13-16. 565 linguas septuaginta duas: see Augustine, *De civ. Dei* 16.6 (CCL 48.506-507; PL 41.484-85). elegisti totidem discipulos: see Lc 10:1-12. 567-569 cecis uisum . . . mortuis uitam: cf. Mt 11:5: 'Caeci vident, claudi ambulant, leprosi mundantur, surdi audiunt, mortui resurgunt'; see also Lc 9:22. 569 filiam archisynagogi: see Mc 5:22-43. filium uidue: see Lc 7:11-17. 570 Lazarum: see Jo 11:38-44. 571-573 Deus ipse . . . mutorum: Is 35:4-6. 573 demonia eiecisti: see Mt 8:28-34. 574 quinque panibus: see Mt 14:13-21. 574-575 supra mare ambulasti: see Mt 14:22-31. 575-576 in ore piscis staterem: see Mt 17:26. 576 ter erat negaturus: see Mt 26:70-75; Mc 14:68-72; Lc 22:57-62. 576-578 illis qui preparaturi . . . pascha: see Lc 22:10-12. 579 Sicut Moyses: Jo 3:14. 581 Cum exaltatus: Jo 12:32. 584-586 Ecce . . . resurget: Mt 20:18-19.

564 declarares] -eres MS. te²] *delevi* 569 filium] -iam MS.; cf. Lc 7:12

Sexta meditatio.

Procede anima mea cum domino tuo de miraculorum gloria ad passionis sue
 contumeliam. Suspende interim delitias meditationis, interrompe quietem
 590 contemplationis. Quomodo enim poteris non turbari, non dolere uidens dominum
 tuum coram te et pro te tot modis illudi, tot penis uexari? Set quanto fuerit maior
 in passione eius tibi compassionis amaritudo, tanto erit copiosior in eius resurrec-
 tionem tibi congratulacionis dulcedo. Appropinquante hora passionis tue, uoluisti
 domine ad locum passionis appropinquare, ut ostenderes te non inuitum set
 595 spontanea uoluntate pro nostra salute mortem crucis passurum. Vt autem te nemo
 esse regem Israel et mundi redemptorem dubitaret, uenisti ad locum passionis sicut
 te uenturum propheta predixerat et lex presignauerat. Ait enim propheta: 'Dicite
 filie Syon. Ecce rex tuus uenit tibi mansuetus sedens super asinam et pullum filium
 subiugalis'. Vt ergo ostenderes te esse eum de quo propheta hoc predixerat, in
 600 asino uenisti ad locum passionis tue cum magna humilitate et mansuetudine. In
 lege autem continetur preceptum fuisse a domino in Egipto ut unusquisque filiorum
 p. 176 Israel per domos et familias tolleretur de grege agnum absque macula, / masculum
 agniculum, decima die mensis primi, et seruaret eum usque ad quartumdecimum
 diem eiusdem mensis, et eadem die ad uesperam immolaret eundem agnum, et de
 605 eius sanguine utrumque postem et superliminare domus sue liniret. Quod ita
 factum est. Et per sanguinem agni liberati sunt filii Israel a morte corporali. Vt ergo
 ostenderes domine te per agnum illum fuisse significatum, uenisti in Ierusalem
 tanquam in domicilium et locum passionis tue decimo die mensis primi, que tunc
 erat Dominica palmarum, et seruatus eras; et non occisus usque ad quartumdeci-
 610 mum diem eiusdem mensis, que tunc erat feria quinta. Ad uesperum eiusdem diei
 quando eras a discipulo traditus et ab inimicis tuis comprehensus, cepit immolatio
 tua, inchoata est passio tua, que in sequenti die completa est quando eras
 crucifixus, primo linguis Iudeorum, et postea manibus gentilium, ut eadem die,
 scilicet feria sexta, redimeretur homo per lignum patibuli qua primo peccauit per
 615 lignum paradisi. Tunc impletum est quod de te ait Ysaia propheta: 'Non erat ei
 species neque decor. Et uidimus eum et non erat aspectus, et desiderauimus eum
 despectum, et nouissimum uirorum; <uirum> dolorum et scientem infirmitatem.
 Et quasi absconditus uultus eius, et despectus: unde nec reputauimus eum. Vere
 languores nostros ipse tulit, et dolores nostros ipse portauit. Et nos putauimus eum

596 uenisti ad locum passionis: see Mt 21:4-9; Mc 11:7-10; Lc 19:35-38; Jo 12:12-16. 597 Di-
 cite: Mt 21:5; see also Is 62:11. 600-605 In lege . . . liniret: see Ex 12:1-7. 602-603 ag-
 num . . . agniculum: cf. Ex 12:5: 'Erit autem agnus absque macula, masculus, agniculus'; 1 Petr 1:19:
 'sed pretioso sanguine quasi agni immaculati Christi, et incontaminati.' 615-622 Non erat . . .
 sumus: Is 53:2-5.

614 peccauit] uocauit ms. 617 uirum] *suppleui*; cf. Is 53:2

- 620 quasi leprosum et percussum a deo et humiliatum. Ipse autem uulneratus est propter iniquitates nostras, attritus est propter scelera nostra. Disciplina pacis nostre super eum, et liuore eius sanati sumus'. Et post pauca: 'Oblatus est quia ipse uoluit, et non aperuit os suum. Sicut ouis ad occisionem ducetur, et sicut agnus coram tondente se obmutescet, et non aperiet os suum'. Ecce domine tu es agnus
- p. 177 625 ille absque macula, quia / innocens, paciens, atque mitis in cruce oblatu pro nostra salute. Video te a terra exaltatum in ligno sicut Moyses exaltauit serpentem in deserto. Fac ut uideam te sicut tu uis uideri in uita presenti, scilicet oculis fidei, per dileccionem operantis, ut sic merear consequi quod promisisti, scilicet ut non peream, set habeam in regno tuo uitam eternam. Video te domine contumeliis
- 630 affectum, iniuriis afflictum, uinculis constrictum, flagellis cesum, colaphis attritum, palmis percussum, sputis oblitum, spinis coronatum, felle potatum, clauis confixum, lancea perforatum, inter latrones suspensum. Hinc tibi condoleo et compator. Tibi merito debeo compati, cui in cruce pendenti etiam muta elementa modo suo compassa sunt. Sol ne uideret te dominum suum in cruce pendentem
- 635 auertit uultum suum, subtraxit radios suos, et facte sunt tenebre super uniuersam terram a sexta hora usque ad horam nonam. Velum templi cissum est in duas partes a summo usque deorsum. Terra mota est, et petre cisse sunt, et monumenta aperta sunt, et multa corpora sanctorum qui dormierant surrexerunt. Et exeuntes de monumentis post resurrectionem tuam uenerunt in sanctam ciuitatem et apparue-
- 640 runt multis. Centurio autem et qui cum eo erant custodientes te, uiso terre motu et hiis que fiebant, timuerunt ualde dicentes: 'Uere dei filius erat iste'. Ecce domine contristat me passionis tue memoria, set letificat me eiusdem passionis pia intentio et redemptionis nostre modus conueniens. Licet enim posses alio modo humanum genus liberare, non tamen erat possibilis alius modus conueniencior. Quomodo
- 645 enim posses melius et manifestius dileccionem tuam nobis ostendere, et nostram erga te excitare, quam per hoc quod pro nobis / dignatus es exinanire temet ipsum, p. 178 et formam serui accipere, et in ea crucifigi, et in cruce mori? Quo maiori effectu

622-624 Oblatus est . . . suum: Is 53:7. 624-625 agnus ille absque macula: see note on lines 602-603. 626 Moyses exaltauit: cf. Jo 3:14: 'Et sicut Moyses exaltauit serpentem in deserto, ita exaltari oportet Filium hominis.' 628-629 non peream . . . eternam: cf. Jo 3:15: 'ut omnis qui credit in ipsum, non pereat, sed habeat uitam aeternam.' 629-632 contumeliis affectum . . . suspensum: see Mt 26:67-68, 27:26-31, 34-38; Mc 14:65, 15:15-20, 23-27; Lc 22:63-65, 23:33; Jo 19:1-3, 18, 34. 635-636 facte sunt tenebrae . . . nonam: cf. Mt 27:45: 'A sexta autem hora tenebrae factae sunt super universam terram usque ad horam nonam'; see also Mc 15:33; Lc 23:44-45. 636-641 Velum templi . . . iste: cf. Mt 27:51-55: 'Et ecce velum templi scissum est in duas partes a summo usque deorsum: et terra mota est, et petrae scissae sunt, et monumenta aperta sunt: et multa corpora sanctorum qui dormierant, surrexerunt. Et exeuntes de monumentis post resurrectionem eius, uenerunt in sanctam ciuitatem, et apparuerunt multis. Centurio autem, et qui cum eo erant, custodientes Iesum, viso terraemotu et his quae fiebant, timuerunt ualde, dicentes: Vere Filius Dei erat iste'; see also Mc 15:39; Lc 23:45, 47. 646-647 exinanire . . . mori: cf. Phil 2:7-8: 'sed semetipsum exinanivit formam servi accipiens, in similitudinem hominum factus, et habitu inventus ut homo. Humiliauit semetipsum factus obediens usque ad mortem, mortem autem crucis.'

posset nobis in hoc statu dilectio tua commendari? Nullo quidem. Inde est quod dixisti: 'Maiorem caritatem nemo habet ut animam suam ponat quis pro amicis
 650 suis'. Hinc sponsa tua, scilicet sancta ecclesia, te maxime diligit, quia non solum es candidus, set etiam factus es in cruce rubicundus. Ut enim sponsam tuam feruentius in tui amorem accenderes, candorem humanitatis tue rubore sanguinis tui in cruce tua effusi purpurare uoluisti. Quamuis enim ab initio conceptionis tue factus sis speciosus forma pre filiis hominum peccati immunitate et gratiarum
 655 plenitudine, tamen non satis placeret ei speciositas tua, si tantum esses candidus et non rubicundus. Vt ergo ei perfecte placeres et prodesses, uirtutum tuarum candori ruborem martirii quasi lilio rosam sociasti. Inde est quod ipsa de te et in te gloriatur dicens: 'Dilectus meus candidus et rubicundus electus ex milibus'. Multe sunt cause, multe sunt rationes, quare te debeamus diligere. Set nulla maior
 660 causa, nulla cogentior ratio, quam redemptionis nostre modus. Debemus diligere te quia nos creasti, quia nos nutriti, quia pascis, quia uestis, sed ideo maxime quia nos redemisti tali modo, scilicet morte tua, et tali genere mortis, scilicet morte crucis, quod erat tunc temporis uilissimum genus mortis, quo puniebantur latrones et illi qui magna scelera commiserant. Quanto enim pro hominibus abiectiora pati
 665 dignatus es, tanto magis ab hominibus honorari et diligi dignus es. Inde est quod apostolus mortem tuam pro maximo beneficio reputans ait: 'Christus factus est pro nobis obediens usque ad mortem: mortem autem crucis'. Hinc beatus Iohannes: 'Qui dilexit nos et lauit nos a peccatis nostris in sanguine / suo'. Quis est tante
 p. 179 duricie et obstinationis ut non possit animum suum inclinare ad te diligendum, qui
 670 tantum dilexisti nos, ut lauares nos a peccatis nostris in sanguine tuo? Quis est qui non possit te feruentius et dulcius diligere, quando recordatur quod in cruce brachia tua extendisti tanquam desiderans nos amplecti et recipere omnes qui ad te confugere uoluerint? Ecce domine confugio ad te, recipe quem redemisti, noli me abicere quem tam caro precio emisti. Dulce est michi domine cum predictis
 675 considerare illud quod dixisti de morte et resurrectione tua: 'Potestatem habeo ponendi animam meam, et iterum assumendi eam'. Tu animam tuam posuisti, id est separasti eam a carne, neutram tamen a diuinitate. Inde est quod in anima tua descendisti ad infernum, et mordens eum eripuisti electos, solis reprobis ibi relictis.

649 Maiorem caritatem: Jo 15:13. 651 candidus . . . rubicundus: cf. Cant 5:10: 'Dilectus meus candidus et rubicundus.' 654 speciosus . . . hominum: cf. Ps 44:3: 'speciosus forma prae filiis hominum . . .' 658 Dilectus meus: Cant 5:10. 666 Christus factus: cf. Phil 2:8; the quoted text is from the Graduale for Maundy Thursday. 668 Qui dilexit: Apoc 1:5. 674 tam caro precio emisti: cf. 1 Cor 6:20: 'Empti enim estis pretio magno.' 675 Potestatem habeo: Jo 10:18. 678 descendisti ad infernum: cf. Mt 12:40: 'Sicut enim fuit Ionas in ventre ceti tribus diebus, et tribus noctibus, sic erit Filius hominis in corde terrae tribus diebus et noctibus.'

654 speciosus] sponsus ms.; cf. Ps 44:3

Tunc impleta est prophetia illa: 'O mors ero mors tua, morsus tuus ero inferne!'
 680 Qui moriendo animam tuam posuisti, iterum, scilicet tertia die resurgendo, eam
 sumpsisisti, id est carni iterum coniunxisti glorificando utrumque, scilicet animam
 in passibilitate et corpus in mortalitate, et utrumque ineffabili decore et iocunditate.
 De morte autem resurgens apparuisti primo Marie Magdalene de qua eieceras
 septem demonia. O mira pietatis tue uiscera! O preclarum penitentie preconium!
 685 O dulce spei solacium peccatoribus si penitere uoluerint! Ecce enim mulier illa que
 fuit septem demonibus plena, id est uniuersis uiciorum generibus fedata, ad
 misericordie tue fontem penitendo uenit, et tam copiosam ibi gratiam inuenit qua
 non solum facta est munda set sancta, set tibi tam dilecta, tam familiaris ut ei post
 resurrectionem tuam priusquam alicui apostolorum tuorum appareres. Dulce est
 690 considerare quod resurrectionis tue gloriam paulatim et per incrementum temporis
 reuelasti, quia tanta erat uirtus miraculi ut hanc / repente totam fragilia mortalium
 pectora capere non possent. Ex serie autem euuangelii habemus decem apparitio-
 nes tuas.

De decem apparitionibus Christi.

695 Primo enim apparuisti Marie Magdalene flenti ad monumentum. Secundo eidem
 et alie Marie regredientibus nuntiare discipulis quod uiderant. Tercio Symoni
 Petro. Quarto Cleophe et socio eius in uia. Quinto, illis regressis et narrantibus
 quomodo cognouerunt te in fractione panis, apparuisti ianuis clausis discipulis tuis
 quando non erat cum eis Thomas. Sexto post dies octo quando erat Thomas cum
 700 eis. Septimo piscantibus ad mare Tyberiadis. Octauo in monte Galilee. Nono
 apparuisti eis undecim recumbentibus in die qua ascendisti. Decimo autem
 uiderunt te non in terra positum set iam in aera eleuatum et celos petentem,
 dicentibus angelis: 'Sic ueniet quemadmodum uidisti eum euntem in celum'. Plures
 autem fuisse appariciones tuas ostendit Paulus dicens: 'Tradidi enim uobis in
 705 primis quod et accepi quoniam Christus mortuus est pro peccatis nostris secundum
 scripturas. Et quia uisus est Cephe, et post hec undecim. Deinde uisus est plus
 quam quingentis fratribus simul ex quibus multi manent usque adhuc, quidam
 autem dormierunt. Deinde uisus est Iacobo. Deinde apostolis omnibus. Nouissime
 autem omnium tanquam abortiuo uisus est et michi'. Hoc testimonium Pauli tam
 710 ualidum est et ita omnibus sufficere debet ut quicumque hoc audierit, de resurrec-
 tione tua certus efficiatur.

679 O mors: Os 13:14; see also 1 Cor 15:55-57. 683-684 Marie . . . demonia: cf. Lc 8:2: 'Maria, quae uocatur Magdalene, de qua septem daemones exierant . . .' 688-689 ut ei . . . appareres: see Jo 20:11-18. 695-703 Primo: Jo 20:11-18; Secundo: Mt 28:8-10; Tercio: Lc 24:34; Quarto: Lc 24:15-35; Quinto: Lc 24:36-45; Sexto: Jo 20:24-29; Septimo: Jo 21:1-24; Octauo: Mt 28:16-18; Nono: Mc 16:14-18; Decimo: Act 1:9-11. 703 Sic ueniet: Act 1:11. 704-709 Tradidi enim . . . michi: 1 Cor 15:3-8.

Septima meditacio.

- O quam beati erant illi qui meruerunt post resurrectionem tuam faciem tuam uidere, corpus tuum glorificatum palpare, et palpando in fide confirmari et
- 115 ineffabili gaudio affici! Heu quod tunc non affui, quod te non uidi, quod illius miraculosi tactus et illius ineffabilis gaudii particeps esse non potui! Set solatio
- p. 181 michi / est quod beato Thome dixisti: 'Quia uidisti me credidisti: beati qui non uiderunt et crediderunt'. Ecce domine uidere te non potui, set credere possum et sic beatus. Fac me credere et sufficit michi: set te docente didici quod nulla fides
- 720 nisi illa que per dilectionem operatur ad beatitudinem promerendam sufficit. Illa ergo si in me est, a te conseruetur; si non est, infundatur. Dulce est michi domine cum predictis cogitare quod in die ascensionis tue priusquam ascenderes, ut ueritas carnis tue magis innotesceret, dignatus es cum discipulis tuis cibum sumere. Quod eis promissisti carismata spiritus sancti, precipiens ab Iherosolimis ne discederent,
- 725 set expectarent promissionem patris. Dulce est ad memoriam reuocare uerba illa que extremo discipulis tuis locutus es dicens: 'Euntes in mundum uniuersum predicate euangelium omni creature. Qui crediderit et baptizatus fuerit, saluus erit. Qui uero non, condemnabitur'. Dulce est considerare quod uidentibus discipulis tuis de monte Oliueti ascendens ferebaris in celum, et eleuatis manibus benedixisti
- 730 eis, et nubes te suscepit ab oculis eorum. Dulce est considerare quales aderant ascensionis tue testes, scilicet angeli et apostoli tui. Tunc impletum est quod psalmista ait: 'Ascendit deus in iubilo, dominus in uoce tube'. Tunc enim ascendisti in iubilo, id est ineffabili gaudio apostolorum, et in uoce tube, id est in manifesta predicatione angelorum dicentium: 'Hic Iesus qui assumptus est a uobis in celum
- 735 sic ueniet quemadmodum uidistis eum euntem in celum'. Ascendens in altum captiuam duxisti captiuitatem, id est animas illas in celestem patriam tecum introduxisti quas de captiuitate diaboli et ab inferni claustro liberasti. Quis non gaudeat de ineffabili gaudio quo afficiebantur angeli uidentes humanitatem tuam glorificatam et tanta claritate fulgentem, ut tota celestis patria nouo inde illustretur
- p. 182 740 splendore? Quis non delectetur considerare cum / quanta ueneratione ceperunt angeli humanitatem tuam supra se exaltatam adorare, et tantam ei reuerentiam exhibere, ut a nullo homine ulterius se permitterent adorari? Nam cum postea beatus Iohannes uellet angelum adorare, idem angelus prohibuit dicens: 'Uide ne feceris. Conseruus enim tuus sum et fratrum tuorum habentium testimonium Iesu.
- 745 Deum adora'. Gratias ago tibi dulcissime domine quod sic naturam nostram in

717 Quia uidisti: Jo 20:29. 726-728 Euntes . . . condemnabitur: Mc 16:15. 730 et nubes . . . eorum: cf. Act 1:9: 'et nubes suscepit eum ab oculis eorum.' 732 Ascendit deus: Ps 46:6. 734 Hic Iesus: Act 1:11. 735-736 Ascendens . . . captiuitatem: cf. Eph 4:8: 'Ascendens in altum captiuam duxit captiuitatem'; see also Ps 67:19. 743-745 Uide ne feceris . . . adora: cf. Apoc 22:9: 'Vide ne feceris: conseruus enim tuus sum, et fratrum tuorum prophetarum, et eorum qui seruant uerba prophetiae libri huius: Deum adora.'

719 sic] non (*expunct.*) *add.* MS. 735 sic] .i. (*abbr.*) MS.

resurrectione et in ascensione tua honorasti, quod sic in nobis spem nostre
 resurrectionis et ascensionis confirmasti. Gratias ago tibi quod pro nobis passus
 es, nobis relinquens exemplum ut sequamur uestigia tua; set quia nichil possum
 facere sine te, fac me sequi uestigia tua in cruce per dolorem penitencie. In
 750 sepultura per requiem conscientie. In resurrectione per operationem iusticie. In
 ascensione per contemplacionem et desiderium celestis glorie. Dulce est domine
 Ihesu considerare quod decimo die post ascencionem tuam completa est promissio
 tua, quando factus est repente de celo sonus, tanquam aduenientis spiritus
 uehementis, et repleuit totam domum ubi erant apostoli tui sedentes, et apparue-
 755 runt illis dispertite lingue tanquam ignis seditque supra singulos eorum. Et repleti
 sunt omnes spiritu sancto et ceperunt loqui uariis linguis apostoli, prout spiritus
 sanctus dabat eloqui illis. Dulce est domine considerare quare dedisti apostolis tuis
 spiritum sanctum in specie ignis et in specie linguarum. Per hec signa domine
 pulcre ostendisti foris quod intus operabatur spiritus sanctus. In igne est splendor
 760 et calor. In specie ergo ignis datus est apostolis spiritus sanctus, quia eis contulit
 splendorem scientie et calorem caritatis tam perfecte ut omnia que necessaria erant
 ad salutem scirent et ea omnibus predicare auderent. Ideo autem in specie
 linguarum apparuit, quia noticiam omnium linguarum eis contulit. Hec enim tria
 183 necessaria erant in predi/cacione tocius mundi, scilicet scientia predicationis,
 765 perfectio caritatis, noticia omnium linguarum. Quomodo enim possent predicare
 nisi scirent omnia que ad salutem spectarent? Et si omnia scirent et loqui non
 auderent, quid esset? Ideo diffusa est in cordibus eorum per spiritum sanctum
 caritas perfecta, ut ea inflammati auderent omnibus omnia loqui, non timentes
 aliquid quod non erat timendum, scilicet non reges, non principes, non uincula,
 770 non uerbera, non carcerem, non crucem, non aliquid genus martirii aut mortis. Set
 quamuis scirent et auderent omnibus omnia loqui que necessaria erant ad salutem,
 quomodo possent omnibus prodesse sine noticia omnium linguarum, cum mundus
 diuisus esset per linguas septuaginta duas? Patet ergo quod ad conuersionem tocius
 mundi necessaria erant apostolis tria predicta, scilicet scientia predicationis,
 775 perfectio caritatis, et noticia omnium linguarum. O mirabilis et ideo michi dulcis
 et delectabilis sapientie tue dispositio qua illis collata sunt illa tria uniuerso mundo
 tam necessaria! O quam suauiter arserunt corda eorum interius, foris apparentibus
 linguis igneis! O quanta gratiarum plenitudine, tam uelociter, tam mirifice, ope-

753-757 factus est . . . illis: cf. Act 2:2-4: 'et factus est repente de caelo sonus, tanquam aduenientis spiritus uehementis, et repleuit totam domum ubi erant sedentes. Et apparuerunt illis dispertitae linguae tanquam ignis, seditque supra singulos eorum: et repleti sunt omnes Spiritu sancto, et coeperunt loqui variis linguis, prout Spiritus sanctus dabat eloqui illis.' 773 linguas septuaginta duas: see line 565 and note.

747 nobis] uobis ms.

- rante spiritu sancto sunt repleti! O quanta inde iocunditate saginati! Illo suauissimo
 780 igne spiritus sancti domine Iesu illumina et accende cor meum. Illumina ad
 cognicionem ueritatis, accende ad amorem uirtutis. Illumina, ne sentiam quod non
 est sentiendum. Accende, ne timeam quod non est timendum. Fac me habere
 linguam igneam, scilicet talem que auditores meos te operante illuminet ut uiam
 uite uideant, et accendat ut per eam incedere uelint. Fac me imitari apostolos in
 785 uarietate linguarum per uarios modos instructionis, scilicet ut sciam instruere
 diuersa genera hominum pro qualitate et capacitate singulorum. Predictis donis
 apostoli tui domine instructi et animati ceperunt predicare, te cooperante et
 sermonem confirmante / sequentibus signis, cum ipsi misterium a seculis abscondi-
 tum publicarent, scilicet unum deum esse tres personas, scilicet patrem et filium
 790 et spiritum sanctum, et pro salute humani generis solum filium esse incarnatum,
 natum, passum, crucifixum, mortuum, sepultum, resurrexisse, et ad celos ascen-
 disse, et apostolis suis carismata spiritus sancti sicut promiserat dedisse. Quis eis
 tam mira, tam insolita predicantibus crederet nisi eorum predicatio prodigiis
 sequentibus probaretur? Set cum inciperent in nomine Christi eicere demonia,
 795 erigere claudos, illuminare cecos, dare mutis loquelam, mundare leprosos, et etiam
 suscitare mortuos, et omnem languorem curare, quis posset eis non credere nisi
 esset nimie obstinationis et duricie, cum constaret eos non posse per inuocationem
 diuini nominis tam mira operari si de deo falsa loquerentur? Quis potuit non
 credere Petro, qui Thabitam orando de morte suscitauit, mentientes sibi Ananiam
 800 et Saphiram uerbo prostrauit, et infirmos etiam umbra sua curauit, et aliis innume-
 ris prodigiis choruscauit? Quid de ceteris apostolis dicatur? Quis recitare possit
 quam multa signa et prodigia fiebant per manus apostolorum in plebe, quomodo
 magnificabat eos populus, et quam multi uisis prodigiis ad fidem confluebant? Quis
 potuit non mirari tam mirabile, cum uideret quod multi statim post baptismi
 805 percepcionem ceperunt loqui linguis nouis deum laudando et fidem predicando?
 Quis potuit non mirari tam mirabilem, tam subitam in apostolis factam mutacio-
 nem, qui de idiotis et illiteratis facti sunt tam sapientes ut nemo eorum sapientie
 resistere posset? Hinc quidam sapiens ait: 'Inter omnia mira que dominus gessit
 in terris, hoc unum enituit et cetera omnia illustrauit, quod in paucis simplicibus
 810 totum mundum et omnem sapientie eius altitudinem sibi subiugauit; set de
 mutacione dextere excelsi que facta est in Petro'. Quomodo / silere possim, cum
 ipsa tanto sit memoria dignior, quanto ceteris mirabilior? Petrus enim factus est de

788-789 ipsi misterium . . . publicarent: cf. Rom 16:25: 'Ei autem, qui potens est vos confirmare iuxta Evangelium meum, et praedicationem Iesu Christi, secundum reuelationem mysterii temporibus aeternis taciti.' 799 Thabitam: see Act 9:36-42. Ananiam: see Act 5:1-6. 800 infirmos . . . curauit: see Act 5:15-16. 808 quidam sapiens: unidentified.

- ydiotha doctor ecclesie, de apostata princeps apostolorum, de piscatore imperator mundi, de peccatore ianitor celi. Quis tam miser, tam reus ut non possit hinc
 815 concipere spem uenie si penitere uoluerit? Quis amodo desperet? Quis diffidat? Apostolis tuis domine eodem anno ascencionis tue addidisti strenuissimum adiutorem, scilicet Paulum, qui ad fidem mirabiliter conuersus mirabilius ceteris enituit uerbo, exemplo, stilo. Quis enim tam infidelis qui non possit credere immo in fide confirmari intellecta doctrina Pauli? Que uirtus est quam ipse non doceat?
 820 Quod uicium quod ipse non expugnet? Postremo quidem in Christiana religione quod non sit conditum doctrina Pauli?

Octaua meditacio.

Uidens inimicus humani generis per predicacionem apostolorum et ceterorum fidelium multos ad fidem Christi confluere, acriori exarsit inuidia excitando in eos
 825 persecutionem multiplicem per principes et potestates mundanas. Set unde ipse nitebatur ut numerus fidelium minueretur, inde magis augebatur. Quo enim plures persecutione seuiente facti sunt martires, eo pluribus eorum passio et mors choruscauit miraculis, et inde plures ad fidem sunt conuersi. Cum autem Constantinus imperator et ceteri principes miraculorum gloria moti fidem Christi suscepissent, facta est in ecclesia pax et tranquillitas magna. Set rursus inuidia diaboli
 830 machinante obortum est aliud genus persecucionis per uarias hereses, inpu gnantes nunc misterium trinitatis, nunc fidem incarnationis Christi, nunc sacramentum corporis et sanguinis eius, nunc alios articulos fidei nostre. Set hec quoque persecucio facta est ecclesie occasio maioris glorie, honoris, et profectus. Tunc
 186 835 enim nobilis ille thesaurus sapientie et religionis, qui / in multis quasi absconditus latuerat, cepit reuelari et latius choruscare argumentorum elegantia et miraculorum uirtute. Hiis enim duobus modis, scilicet catholice doctrine allegacionibus et miraculorum testimoniis, extincte sunt hereses, conuicti heresiarche, confusi heretici, quorum alii penitentes ad ecclesie unitatem redierunt. Alii in pertinacia
 840 sua persistentes terribilem et infelicem sortiti sunt finem. Sic dilatata est fama Christi, sic manifestata est uirtus crucis, sic roborata est fides, sic multiplicati sunt fideles. O mirabilis sapientia tua domine qua nosti malis sic bene uti ut inimici tui unde uoluntati tue resistere nituntur, inde seruire compellantur! Quod mali bonis machinantur ad contumeliam, tu eis semper committas ad gloriam. In quo apparet
 845 sapientia tua mirabilior? Vnde nobis meditacio iocundior? Vnde nobis consolatio maior? Secure sperare possunt amici tui quando paciuntur contumelias et obprobria, quod eos inde sequetur maior gloria et honor. Vtinam ergo domine, utinam sim amicus tuus, quia si amicus tuus fuero, in nulla tribulatione deerit michi solatium, in nulla aduersitate deerit michi materia sperandi meliora. Nonne olim

- 850 filii Iacob succensi inuidia fratrem suum Ioseph uendiderunt ne eis aliquando dominari posset, set per hoc quod uenditus est factus est dominus eorum? Sic Iudei ne mundus post te abiret, ne ipsi amitterent locum et gentem, te morti tradiderunt; set per hoc et mundus post te abiit, et ipsi amiserunt locum et gentem. Iudei qui edificabant alios in cultu unius dei reprobabant te quasi lapidem edificio inutilem
- 855 tradentes te passioni et morti. Set per hoc quod sic reprobabant te, factus es lapis angularis coniungens in te duos parietes, scilicet Iudeos et gentiles, non id agente crucifigentium intencione, set tua mirabili uirtute. Hinc propheta miratur et
- p. 187 gloriatur dicens: 'Lapidem quem reprobauerunt / edificantes hic factus est in caput anguli. A domino factum est istud, et est mirabile in oculis nostris'. Sic diabolus
- 860 et membra sua conabantur per tormenta et hereses fidem tuam abolere, fideles extinguere, et ecclesiam expugnare. Set inde malis eorum te mirabiliter utente, sicut superius ostensum est, roborata est fides, multiplicati sunt fideles, et creuit ecclesia constructa ex Iudeis et gentilibus, tanquam ex duobus parietibus coniunctis in te lapide angulari. Quidam tamen Iudei tante erant duricie et obstinacionis ut nec per
- 865 scripture sacre testimonium, nec per miraculorum uirtutem ad fidem Christi possent conuerti. Vnde apostolus: 'Cecitas ex parte contigit in Israel'. O mira cecitas Iudeorum, qui uidere non possunt aut nolunt impleta in Christo que in lege Moysi et in prophetis et in psalmis de illo scripta sunt! Quando legitur eis Moyses, uocem eius audiunt, set faciem eius uidere non possunt, quia peccatis eorum
- 870 exigentibus positum est super cor eorum uelamen duricie et infidelitatis. Recte prefigurati sunt per Chaim, qui occiso fratre suo Abel, maledictus est a domino, et factus uagus et profugus super terram.

Nona meditacio.

- Sic enim Iudei, occiso Christo qui erat frater eorum, quia de eadem stirpe natus
- 875 est, maledicti sunt a domino, uagi et profugi, et per diuersas regiones dispersi. Percussi sunt omnes malediccione illa que scripta est in psalmo ubi dicitur: 'Fiat mensa eorum coram ipsis in laqueum et in retributiones et in scandalum. Obscurentur oculi eorum ne uideant, et dorsum eorum semper incurua'. Manet super eos uindicta quam patres eorum inprecabantur sibi et suis, dicentes de

850-851 filii Iacob . . . eorum: see Gen 37:5-47:12. 851-853 Sic Iudei . . . gentem: see Jo 11:48: 'Si dimittimus eum sic, omnes credent in eum, et venient romani, et tollent nostrum et locum, et gentem.' 854 reprobabant te . . . inutilem: see Mt 21:42. 855-856 lapis angularis: see Eph 2:20 and note on line 449. 858-859 Lapidem . . . nostris: Ps 117:22-23; cf. Mt 21:42-43, 1 Petr 2:7. 866 Cecitas: Rom 11:25. 868-870 Quando . . . uelamen: cf. 2 Cor 3:15: 'sed usque in hodiernum diem, cum legitur Moyses, uelamen positum est super cor eorum.' 871 Chaim: see Gen 4:15-16. 876-878 Fiat mensa . . . incurua: Ps 68:23-24.

863 coniunctis] -uictis ms. 868 legitur] legit ms.; cf. 2 Cor 3:15

- 880 Christo: 'Sanguis eius super nos'; et manus eorum adhuc plene sunt quodammodo sanguine Christi et pollute, dum persistunt in errore quo patres eorum morti Christum tradiderunt. Hinc comminatur eis deus pater dicens: 'Cum extenderitis manus uestras, auertam oculos meos a uobis. Et cum multiplicaueritis orationem, non exaudiam. Manus enim uestre plene sunt sanguine'. O mira cecitas Iudeorum,
- . 188 885 qui nobis / in fide sociari nolunt, cum uideant se pro peccatis suis tam longo dampnatos exilio, et fidem nostram gloria et honore sullimatam, a sapientioribus et potencioribus in mundo susceptam, quam ueram esse, innumera sanctorum multitudo probauit, uerbo doctrine, exemplo uite, et sanguinis sui effusione! O mira cecitas Iudeorum et Saracenorum qui nolunt credere Christianis tanquam
- 890 sapientioribus, immo omni sapientia eruditis! Que est enim scientia scripturarum qua non polleant Christiani? Ipsi habent scientiam ueteris testamenti quam habent Iudei. Ipsi habent scientiam noui testamenti qua carent Iudei et Saraceni. Ipsi habent scientiam gentilium philosophorum et omnium sapientium qui scripta sua posteris reliquerunt, habent septem liberales artes et ceteras disciplinas philosophi-
- 895 cas in quibus mira subtilitas continetur, in quibus humana ratio exercitata plurimum proficere potest ad comprehensionem inuisibilium substantiarum, scilicet dei, et angelorum, et animarum. Si Iudei et Saraceni in disciplinis istis instructi essent et exercitati, forte non tam carnaliter sentirent quam modo sentiunt de substantiis predictis. Postremo tam Iudei quam Saraceni approbant uirtutes, scilicet abstin-
- 900 tiam, humilitatem, patientiam, misericordiam, benignitatem, et dilectionem. Set ubi uident ipsi uirtutes istas florere et habundare nisi in Christianis, licet non in omnibus? Nonne uident ipsi multos Christianos tante abstinentie, ut propter deum, diuiciis et deliciis contemptis, gaudeant in subiectione et paupertate uiuere, et carnem suam domare ieiuniis et abstinentia esce et potus, quantum ualitudo
- 905 permittit? Nonne uident multos tante patientie, ut parati sint propter deum patienter sustinere quaslibet iniurias et molestias, et etiam ipsam mortem? Nonne uident multos tam misericordes, ut miserie omnium tam fidelium quam infidelium compaciantur et subueniant in quibus possunt? / Nonne uident multos tanta
- . 189 benignitate affectos et tam perfecta dilectione dei feruentes, ut omni petenti in
- 910 hospitio uel aliis necessariis subueniant, ut albi monachi, et multi alii uiri religiosi? Vbi inueniuntur aliqui tales inter Iudeos et Saracenos? Quis eorum est qui non sit cupidus, aut auarus, aut aliis uiciis inuolutus, in quibus nemo potest deo placere? Manifeste ergo errant qui credunt Christianos non recte credere, qui tam religiose uiuunt, qui tot uirtutibus habundant. O quantas tibi domine Iesu gratias debemus!

880 Sanguis eius: Mt 27:25. 882-884 Cum extenderitis . . . sanguine: Is 1:15. 910 albi monachi: i.e. the Cistercians, who were well established in England by 1200; see David Knowles, *The Monastic Order in England*, 2nd edition (Cambridge, 1963), pp. 346-62.

890 Que] Quod ms.

- 915 O cum quanta dulcedine et deuocione preceptis tuis obedire nos decet, quos fidei
 tue luce separasti a caligine cecitatis qua inuoluti sunt Iudei, Saraceni, et ceteri
 infideles, qui pro cecitate interiori in tenebras exteriores sunt precipitandi! 'Signa-
 tum est super nos lumen uultus tui domine, dedisti leticiam in corde meo'. Hoc
 lumen et hanc leticiam michi eligo pre diuiciis et deliciis uniuersis. Hec duo
 920 domine Iesu in corde meo confirma et conserua et sufficit michi gratia tua.

Quarta pars de testimoniis scripturarum.

- Facta mentione de infidelibus, dulce est michi domine ad memoriam reuocare
 aliquas ex multis auctoritatibus quibus sancta ecclesia munita et secunda consistit
 contra assultus Iudeorum, Saracenorum, et ceterorum infidelium, qui fidem sancte
 925 trinitatis in pugnant et diuinitatem tuam uel humanitatem negant. Moyses in
 principio libri sui licet obscure tamen satis eleganter personarum trinitatem
 insinuat dicens: 'In principio creauit deus celum et terram. Terra autem erat inanis
 et uacua, et tenebre erant super faciem abissi; et spiritus domini ferebatur super
 aquas'. Ecce per deum notat patrem, per principium filium, qui interrogatus a
 930 Iudeis quis esset respondit: 'Principium qui et loquor uobis'. Per hoc quod dicitur
 hic 'spiritus domini', exprimitur spiritus sanctus. De eodem spiritu sub eadem
 p. 190 appellatione in libro Sapientie dicitur: 'Spiritus domini re/pleuit orbem terrarum'
 et cetera. Item in Ysaia: 'Spiritus domini super me, eo quod unxerit me'. Moyses
 in Genesi refert dominum dixisse: 'Faciamus hominem ad ymaginem et similitudi-
 935 nem nostram'. Ecce quam pulcre, quam eleganter notat personarum pluralitatem
 et diuine nature unitatem. Per hoc enim quod dicit pluraliter 'faciamus' et 'nos-
 tram', notat personarum pluralitatem. Per hoc autem quod dicit singulariter
 'ymaginem' et 'similitudinem', notat unitatem deitatis. Idem misterium trinitatis et
 unitatis notat Ysaia propheta dicens: 'Se audisse seraphin clamantia, sanctus,
 940 sanctus, sanctus, dominus deus sabaoht'. Ecce per hoc quod dicit ter 'sanctus',
 notat personarum trinitatem. Per hoc quod dicitur semel 'dominus deus', notatur
 unitas deitatis. Idem misterium notat psalmista dicens: 'Verbo domini celi firmati
 sunt et spiritu oris eius omnis uirtus eorum'. Item alibi: 'Cor mundum crea in me
 deus, et spiritum rectum innoua in uisceribus meis. Ne proicias me a facie tua, et
 945 spiritum sanctum tuum ne auferas a me. Redde michi leticiam salutaris tui, et
 spiritu principali confirma me'. Ecce hic per spiritum principalem intelligitur pater,
 per spiritum rectum filius, et spiritus sanctus sua propria appellatione designatur.
 Quod autem de misterio trinitatis et unitatis in ueteri testamento obscure dicitur,
 in nouo testamento manifeste aperitur. Personam patris et personam spiritus sancti

917-918 Signatum est: Ps 4:7. 927-929 In principio . . . aquas: Gen 1:1-2. 930 Principium:
 Jo 8:25. 932 Spiritus domini: Sap 1:7. 933 Spiritus domini: Is 61:1. 934 Faciamus: Gen
 1:26. 939 Se audisse: Is 6:3. 942 Verbo domini: Ps 32:6. 943-946 Cor mundum . . . me:
 Ps 50:12-14.

- 950 satis expressisti, cum diceres Nichodemo: 'Nisi quis renatus fuerit ex aqua et spiritu sancto, non potest introire in regnum dei'. De tua autem persona ibi pulcre dixisti: 'Nemo ascendit in celum nisi qui descendit de celo filius hominis qui est in celo. Et sicut Moyses exaltauit serpentem in deserto, ita exaltari oportet filium hominis'. Idem misterium trinitatis satis expressisti iterum dicens: 'Cum uenerit paraclitus
- 955 quem ego mittam uobis a patre, spiritum ueritatis qui a patre procedit, ille testimonium perhibebit de me'. Vt autem de eodem misterio nemo dubitaret, manifeste illud declarasti dicens discipulis tuis: 'Euntes ergo docete omnes gentes, baptizantes eos in nomine patris et filii et spiritus sancti'. Item dixisti: 'Ego et pater vnum sumus'. Per hoc quod dixisti 'sumus', ostendisti pluralitatem personarum.
- . 191 960 Per hoc quod / dixisti 'unum', ostendisti unitatem deitatis. Nec excluditur spiritus sanctus ab hac unitate. Quia ubi nominatur pater uel filius semper intelligitur spiritus sanctus, qui ab utroque procedit, utrique coequalis et consubstantialis. Equalitatem autem personarum eleganter declarasti, cum diceres Philippo: 'Qui uidet me, uidet et patrem'. Sic enim de duobus simillimis dici solet. Qui uidet
- 965 istum, uidet et illum. Deitatem autem tuam et eternitatem eleganter manifestasti, cum diceres Iudeis: 'Abraham pater uester exultaui ut uideret diem meum, et uidit et gauisus est'. Illi autem dixerunt: 'Quinquaginta annos nondum habes et Abraham uidisti?' Tu uero uerbum memoria dignissimum respondisti dicens: 'Amen, amen dico uobis. Antequam Abraham fieret ego sum'. Idem interrogatus a Iudeis quis
- 970 esses, respondisti: 'Principium qui et loquor uobis'. Item dixisti: 'Qui diligit me, diligetur a patre meo, et ego diligam eum, et manifestabo illi me ipsum'. Dulce est michi domine testimoniis tuis adicere etiam testimonia discipulorum tuorum qui tecum ab inicio fuerunt. Fidem trinitatis et incarnationis egregia breuitate comprehendit Petrus dicens: 'Tu es Christus filius dei uiui'. Christus interpretatur unctus.
- 975 Vbi ergo nominatur Christus, intelligitur pater qui unxit, et filius qui unctus est, et spiritus sanctus quo ipse unctus est, et incarnatio tua, secundum quam unctus es plenitudine gratiarum. Item Petrus ait: 'Domine tu omnia scis; tu scis quia amo te'. Ecce qui dicit te omnia scire, te deum esse confitetur. Beatus autem Iohannes euangelista misterium trinitatis et unitatis, et diuinitatis tue et humanitatis, eo
- 980 ceteris elegantius declarauit quo profundius de fonte pectoris tui hausit. Eius testimonium tam ualidum, tam sufficiens est ad persuadendum omnibus ut credant,

950 Nisi quis: Jo 3:5. 952-953 Nemo ascendit . . . hominis: Jo 3:13-14. 954 Cum uenerit: Jo 15:26. 957 Euntes ergo: Mt 28:19. 958 Ego et pater: Jo 10:30. 963-964 Qui uidet: Jo 14:9. 966 Abraham pater: Jo 8:56. 967 Quinquaginta annos: Jo 8:57. 968 Amen, amen: Jo 8:58. 970 Principium: Jo 8:25. Qui diligit: Jo 14:21. 974 Tu es Christus: Mt 16:16. 977 Domine tu: Jo 21:17. 980 de fonte pectoris: cf. Augustine, *Tract. in Ioh.* 124.7: 'de fonte Dominici pectoris solus bibit' (CCL 36.687:22-23; PL 35.1976).

965 istum] iustum ms. 980 pectoris] *obsc. in parte ex eras.*

- p. 192 ut eo intellecto nemo in aliquo fidei articulo dubitare possit. Cui enim magis credendum est quam illi qui est uirgo a te electus, et pro uirginitate sua tibi specialius dilectus, et tunc ab inicio fa/miliarius conuersatus? Ipse in epistola sua
- 985 misterium trinitatis et unitatis que in deo est et deus est manifeste declarauit dicens: 'Tres sunt qui testimonium dant in celo: pater, uerbum, et spiritus sanctus; et hii tres unum sunt'. Ipse in principio euuangelii sui te esse personam aliam a persona patris, set eundem deum esse cum patre et spiritu sancto, et ab eterno cum eis fuisse et omnia in tempore creasse, elegantissime ostendit dicens: 'In principio erat
- 990 uerbum, et uerbum erat apud deum, et deus erat uerbum', et cetera, usque ad illum uersum: 'Et uerbum caro factum est, et habitauit in nobis'. Ecce qui superius ostendit te esse uerum deum, hic satis eleganter ostendit te esse uerum hominem dicens: 'Verbum caro factum est et habitauit in nobis'. Paulus quoque misterium predictum satis manifestat dicens: 'Gratia domini nostri Iesu Christi, et caritas dei,
- 995 et communicatio sancti spiritus, sit cum omnibus uobis'. Idem apertius: 'Misit deus spiritum filii sui in corda nostra clamantem: abba, pater'. Idem de misterio incarnationis tue loquens ait: 'Qui factus est ei ex semine Dauid secundum carnem. Qui predestinatus est filius dei in uirtute secundum spiritum sanctificationis, ex resurrectione mortuorum Iesu Christi domini nostri'. Idem de eodem: 'Hoc sentite
- 1000 in uobis quod et in Christo Iesu. Qui cum in forma dei esset, non rapinam arbitratus est esse se equalem deo, set semet ipsum exinaniuit, formam serui accipiens, in similitudinem hominum factus, et habitu inuentus ut homo'. Idem alibi: 'Multiphariam multisque modis loquens patribus in prophetis, nouissime diebus istis locutus est nobis in filio, quem constituit heredem uniuersorum, per
- 1005 quem fecit et secula. Qui cum sit splendor glorie et figura substantie eius, portansque omnia uerbo uirtutis sue, purgationem peccatorum faciens, sedet ad dexteram maiestatis in excelsis, tanto melior angelis effectus, quanto differentius pre illis nomen hereditauit'. Idem alibi: 'Talis enim decebat ut nobis esset pontifex, sanctus, innocens, impollutus, segregatus a peccatoribus, et excelsior celis factus'.
- 1010 Item: 'Quorum patres et ex quibus Christus, qui est deus super omnia benedictus in secula'. / Cui non placeant ista testimonia tam preclara, tam manifesta? Quis istis auditis uel lectis non dicat: 'In uia testimoniorum tuorum delectatus sum sicut in omnibus diuiciis'? Placent hec michi domine testimonia manifesta, nec displicent obscura. Magna namque utilitas in utrisque continetur. Illa edificant infirmos,
- p. 193

986 Tres sunt: I Jo 5:7-8. 989-991 In principio . . . nobis: Jo 1:1-14. 993 Verbum caro: Jo 1:14. 994 Gratia domini: 2 Cor 13:13. 995 Misit deus: Gal 4:6. 997-999 Qui factus . . . nostri: Rom 1:3-4. 999-1002 Hoc sentite . . . homo: Phil 2:5-7. 1003-1008 Multiphariam . . . hereditauit: Hebr 1:1-4. 1008 Talis enim: Hebr 7:26. 1010 Quorum patres: Rom 9:5. 1012 In uia: Ps 118:14.

995 sit] s. (*abbr.*) *add.* MS. uobis] n. (*abbr.*) MS.

- 1015 ista exercent perfectos. In illis inuenitur lac potus paruulorum, in istis solidus cibus perfectorum. In obscuris inuenit humana ratio exercitum, et fides locum et meritum. Vnde plurimum expedit unicuique qui uerba sacre scripture legit uel audit ut habeat in memoria quod uenerabilis doctor Augustinus de obscuris scripturarum dicit: 'Non accuses', inquit, 'obscura scripturarum que fecit deus ut te exercent, neque dicas, sic diceretur melius: sic enim dictum est ut dici debuit. Antequam ergo scias quare quid dictum sit, non iudices. Crede ita dici debuisse ut dictum est, et hec pietas faciet te capacem'. Credo domine Iesu, credo omnia que a te uel a tuis dicta sunt sic dici debuisse ut dictum est, ut dicta sunt licet michi non pateant singulorum cause dictorum. Fidem illam domine quam apostolis tuis, martiribus, 1025 confessoribus, uirginibus, et omnibus sanctis dedisti in me confirma et conserua: fac me illorum esse in fide imitorem et in regno consortem.

Quinta pars de premiis iustorum. Decima meditatio.

- Hiis anima mea animata et exercitata, progredere ulterius, ascende superius, contemplare subtilius, preliba suauius illa superna gaudia, illas celestes delicias, et 1030 fontem earum, fontem uiuum de quo psalmista ait: 'Quemadmodum desiderat ceruus ad fontes aquarum, ita desiderat anima mea ad te deus. Sitiuit anima mea ad deum fontem uiuum; quando ueniam et apparebo ante faciem dei?' Vt autem facilius tibi dulcescant illa gaudia, reuoca ad memoriam illa beati Gregorii dulcissima uerba: 'Que autem lingua dicere, quis intellectus capere sufficit illa 1035 superne ciuitatis quanta sint gaudia, angelorum choris interesse, cum beatissimis spiritibus glorie conditoris assistere, / presentem dei uultum cernere, incircums-criptum lumen uidere, nullo mortis metu affici, perpetue incorruptionis munere letari?' Ex presentium bonorum magnitudine et multitudine perpendi potest quam magna et quam multa sint illa superna gaudia. Sicut quidam sapiens ait: 'Si tanta 1040 est claritas solis, si tanta est lux illa corporalis quam habemus communem cum bestiis, quanta erit lux illa quam habebimus communem cum angelis?' Si tanta est lux miserorum, quanta erit lux beatorum? Quot sunt oblectamenta oculorum et ceterorum censuum? Quot odores, quot colores, quot sapor, quot sonora, quot suauia? Quot odores mulcent olfactum? Quot colores uisum? Quot sapor gustum?

1015-1016 lac potus paruulorum . . . perfectorum: cf. 1 Cor 3:1-2: 'Tanquam parvulis in Christo, lac vobis potum dedi, non escam'; Hebr 5:12: 'et facti estis quibus lacte opus sit, non solido cibo'; 1 Petr 2:2: 'sicut modo geniti infantes, rationabile, sine dolo lac concupiscite: ut in eo crescat in salutem'; see Augustine, *De doct. christ.* 4.6.9-10 (CCL 32.121-23; PL 34.92-93). 1019-1022 Non accuses . . . capacem: cf. Augustine, *Enarr. in Ps.* 147.2: 'antequam scias quare quid dictum sit, credere ita dici debuisse ut dictum est. Haec enim pietas faciet te capacem' (CCL 40.2140:47-49; PL 37.1915); Alexander has enlarged upon Augustine. 1028 ascende superius: cf. Lc 14:10: 'Amice, ascende superius.' 1030-1032 Quemadmodum . . . dei: Ps 41:2-3 (Vulg. 'ad Deum fortem, vivum'). 1034-1038 Que autem . . . letari: Gregory, *Hom. in Evang.* Liber 1, 37.1 (PL 76.1275B). 1039 quidam sapiens: unidentified.

- 1045 Quot sonora auditum? Quot suaui et mollia tocus corporis tactum? Si tot sunt
delicie corporum, quot erunt delicie spirituum? Si tanta claritas et amenitas est sub
celo, quanto maior in celo? O quantum gaudium erit ibi uidere societatem
hominum electorum glorificatam, et cognoscere ibi parentes, amicos, et quos hic
nouimus, non solum eos, set omnes qui in illa beatorum congregacione erunt!
- 1050 Omnes enim perfecte se inuicem cognoscent ut perfecte gaudere possint. Quo-
modo enim esset ibi perfectum gaudium, nisi esset ibi perfecta cognicio? O quam
iocundum erit ibi uidere mirabilem illam multitudinem angelorum glorie tue
assistentem et ineffabili modo laudantem! Set quanto iocundius, quanto dulcius erit
contemplari ibi mundi reginam, dei genitricem, et semper uirginem super choros
- 1055 angelorum exaltatam, et ineffabili decore et honore glorificatam? Quam dulce et
delectabile erit omnibus electis uidere ineffabilem humanitatis tue glorificate
claritatem, in quam desiderant angeli prospicere, unde tota celestis patria illustrari
uidetur et decorari! Set quanto dulcius, quanto delectabilius contemplari diuinitatis
tue gloriam que est fons omnium gaudiorum et omnium deliciarum? Si dulce est
p. 195 1060 et delectabile uidere solem, lunam, et stellas mira / claritate fulgentes, quanto
dulcius et delectabilius erit uidere gloriosam creatoris claritatem, cum claritas
creaturarum nulla sit respectu claritatis que est in creatore? Si iocundum est cernere
terram arboribus, herbis, floribus, et fructibus ornatam, quanto iocundius contem-
plari floridum uultum tuum domine qui omnia ista creasti? Heu quamdiu morabor
- 1065 in huius exilii miseria, in ualle lacrimarum, in loco peregrinationis, in corpore
mortis huius? Quando ueniam et apparebo ante faciem tuam ut uideam uoluntatem
tuam et gloriam tuam? Quando saciabor apparicione glorie tue? Quando letificabis
me in gaudio cum uultu tuo? Quando dabis michi illam que in regno tuo est
requiem, lucem, et uitam? Que requies uera nisi illa quam non interrompet labor,
- 1070 non tristitia, non tedium, non aliqua miseria? Que lux uera nisi illa que ibi est,
quam non interpollabit nox, cui non succedent tenebre, non caligo? Que uita uera
nisi illa que ibi est, quam non inquietabit languor, non comitabitur dolor, non
sequetur mors? Fac me domine per ineffabilem misericordiam tuam peruenire ad
illam uitam ueram, uitam beatam, quam ut ait quidam sanctus: 'Facilius est
- 1075 consequi quam enarrare, cuius erit cursus sine termino, usus sine fastidio, refectio
sine cibi adiutorio, requies sine noctis ocio, etas sine senio, indeficiens sub uultu
dei claritas, et sub antiquis perpetuisque gaudiis semper noua iocunditas, ac sine
ullo amittendi periculo segura felicitas', quam nec oculus uidit, nec auris audiuit,
nec in cor hominis ascendit, quam preparasti diligentibus te domine Iesu Christe

1057 in quam . . . prospicere: cf. 1 Petr 1:12: ' . . . in quem desiderant angeli prospicere.' 1065 in
ualle lacrimarum: cf. Ps. 83:7: 'In ualle lacrymarum, in loco quem posuit.' in loco peregrinationis:
cf. Ps 118:54: 'in loco peregrinationis meae'; and see line 3 and note. 1065-1066 in corpore
mortis huius: cf. Rom 7:24: 'quis me liberabit de corpore mortis huius?' 1074 quidam sanctus:
unidentified. 1078-1079 quam nec oculus . . . diligentibus: cf. 1 Cor 2:9: 'Quod oculus non uidit,
nec auris audiuit, nec in cor hominis ascendit, quae praepraeparauit Deus iis qui diligunt illum'; see also
Is 64:4.

1080 rex glorie. Qui cum patre et spiritu sancto uiuis et regnas deus per infinita
seculorum secula. Amen.

196 Qui in predictorum contemplacione nondum potest utiliter delectari, orationem
luctuosam que subscripta est frequentet, et ieiuniis, lacrimis, et lamentis studeat
1085 carnales appetitus edomare et mentis aciem purgare, ut / quandoque ad contempla-
tionis gratiam, deo donante, pertingere possit.

Oratio luctuosa.

Confiteor tibi domine deus quia peccaui nimis cogitando, loquendo, operando.
Peccaui grauiter, peccaui tripliciter, quia multa mala commisi, et bona omisi, et illa
pauca bona que feci magna ex parte intencione inanis glorie corrupti. Ecce reduco
1090 ad memoriam peccata que feci contra te, et passionem quam sustinuisti pro me,
et tamen nondum inuenio lacrimas quibus innumeros excessus meos abluam, tanta
est cordis mei duricia. Quid ergo faciam? Quid dicam? Quo me uertam? Vnde
inueniam sacrificium quo ualeam iram tuam placare et ueniam michi impetrare?
Passionem et crucem tuam recolam frequentius, considerabo attentius, ut inde
1095 aliqua in me excitetur compunctio. Ligone compunctionis terram cordis mei
tamdiu perfodiam, donec te donante inueniam lacrimarum aquas quas tibi pro
innumeris peccatis meis in sacrificium possim offerre. Videor michi uidere crucem
tuam et te pro salute mea mortem crucis patientem, et quare forcius non compun-
gor? Quis homo tam inhumanus ut filio dei pro se patienti non compaciatur? Quis
1100 tam lapideum habet cor, aut tam ferreum pectus, ut Christo pro se in cruce
morienti nullo compassionis gladio transfixus commoriatur? Irrationabilis creatura
suo creatori patienti compassa est. Insecabilium durissima, uiscera petrarum ex
dolore scissa sunt. Terra sui ponderis mole immobilis, compaciendo mota est. Sol
ex natura sui lucidissimus, lugendo obscuratus est, et facte sunt tenebre super
1105 uniuersam terram ab hora sexta usque ad nonam. Omnia elementa contremuerunt
et licet muta, uoce tamen qua potuerunt, scilicet sua immutatione, clamauerunt se

1100 lapideum habet cor: cf. Ez 11:19: 'et auferam cor lapideum de carne eorum, et dabo eis cor
carneum . . . ' 1102-1103 uiscera petrarum . . . mota est: cf. Mt 27:51: 'et terramota est, et petrae
scissae sunt . . . ' 1103-1104 Sol . . . obscuratus est: cf. Lc 23:45: 'Et obscuratus est sol et velum
templi scissum est medium.' 1104-1105 facte sunt . . . nonam: cf. Mt 27:45: 'A sexta autem hora
tenebrae factae sunt super uniuersam terram usque ad horam nonam'; see also Lc 23:44.

1082 predictorum] subsequentium *R* utiliter] contemplari uel *add. R* 1083 et'] *om. R*
1084 et mentis aciem purgare] *om. R* 1087 Confiteor] -ebor *R* 1088 tripliciter] multi-
R 1093 iram tuam] ira tua domine Iesu *R* 1094 frequentius] et *add. R* ut inde] at ubi *R*
1095 me] aliqua *add. R* Ligone] Ligorie (*sic*) *R* 1096 lacrimarum aquas] *transp. R*
1098 tuam] domine Iesu *add. R* forcius] *om. R* 1099 Quis'] est *add. R* 1100 pro se]
om. R 1101 transfixus] cruci- *R* 1105 ad] horam *add. R*

p. 197

- mortem domini sui sustinere non posse. Insensibilibus ergo elementis insensibilior sum, si quando uideo dominum meum pro redempcione mea in cruce plagas mortis patientem, aculeos doloris in corde meo / non sentio. Ecce si uideremus aliquem strenuissimum iuuenem, amicitie nobis familiaritate coniunctum, coram nobis flagellari, penis diuersis uexari, paratum etiam mortem ipsam subire nullis suis meritis, nulla sui necessitate, set sola nostri caritate, ut nos a penis uel a morte liberaret, qua illum caritate diligeremus? Quomodo uidentes eum coram nobis pro nobis affligi in ipsius tormentis ipsi torqueremur? Quomodo pro nobis patienti compateremur? Quo doloris gladio transfigeremur? Quam alta suspiria de profundo pectore traheremus? Quomodo si liceret in oscula eius rueremus? Quam dulciter illum amplecteremur? Quantis lacrimarum imbribus illum deosculando perfunderemus? Ecce uideo eum qui est omnium flos iuuenum, qui maturitas senum, qui delicie paruulorum, qui sponsus uirginum, qui castitas nuptarum, qui est continentia uiduarum: illum inquam qui est speciosus forma pre filiis hominum, in quem angeli desiderant prospicere, cuius uultum desiderat uniuersa terra. Illum inquam deum et dominum nostrum, creatorem et saluatorem nostrum, patrem nostrum, fratrem nostrum, filium nostrum, amicissimum nostrum, unicum nostrum, totum bonum nostrum. Illum inquam talem et tantum, scilicet Iesum Christum filium dei.
- Video pro nimia qua me dilexit caritate in cruce pendentem, sanguine manantem, clauis confixum, lancea perforatum, et tot penarum genera pro me patientem, et quare non compacior? Video eum inter ipsa sua tormenta manibus expansis me amplecti desiderantem, et quare totus non soluor in lacrimas? Video eum in cruce pro mea salute morientem, et cur doloris gladio non transfigor? Video lugentes apostolos, merentes discipulos, flentes mulieres. Video assistentem cruci eius beatam Mariam matrem illius semper uirginem, reginam celi, dominam angelorum, ipsam animam eius acutissimo doloris gladio transuerberante secundum Symeonem, non tantum dico plorantem et suspiria longa trahentem, set omnem filii sui

1120 speciosus forma . . . hominum: cf. Ps 44:3: 'Speciosus forma prae filiis hominum, diffusa est gratia in labiis tuis; propterea benedixit te Deus in aeternum.' 1120-1121 in quem angeli . . . prospicere: cf. 1 Petr 1:12: ' . . . in quem desiderant angeli prospicere.' 1121 cuius uultum . . . terra: cf. 3 Reg 10:24: 'Et uniuersa terra desiderabat vultum Salomonis . . .' 1132-1133 ipsam animam . . . Symeonem: see Lc 2:34-35, esp. 'et tuam ipsius animam pertransibit gladius . . .'

1109 patientem] et *add. R* in corde meo non sentio] non sentio in corde meo *R* 1112 nos] uel *add. R* 1113 nobis] et *add. R* 1116 traheremus] trahemus *R* eius] iteratim *add. R* 1117 imbribus] totum *add. R* 1119 est] *om. R* 1121 angeli desiderant] delectant angeli *R* desiderat uniuersa terra] desiderant uniuerse terre *R* inquam] in quem *R* 1122-1124 patrem . . . bonum nostrum] *om. R* 1125 qua me dilexit caritate] caritate qua me dilexit *R* 1127 eum *R*] enim *ms.* expansis] -passis *R* 1129 transfigor] -fodior *R* 1131 illius] eius *R* semper. . . angelorum] *om. R* 1132 ipsam animam eius] et ipsius animam *R* transuerberante] -antem *R* 1133 et] sed *R*

- 198 / passionem in se ipsa suscipientem, cum ea quoque cuncta elementa merentia,
 1135 omnem suspirantem creaturam. Et ego omnia ista uidens, quare non soluor in lacrimas? Quare lacrimari non possum? Video illum cui patienti omnia compaciuntur pro mea dilectione et pro mea salute omnia patientem, et quare non ex intimo cordis affectu resoluor in lacrimas? Vnde michi tanta cordis duricia? Vnde tanta mentis ariditas? Tu ergo domine Iesu Christe per ineffabilem misericordiam tuam
 1140 uince duriciam meam, remoue ariditatem meam. Confige timore tuo carnes meas ut tibi pro me patienti compaciari. Quia tunc uere cum regnante regnabo, si ex uero corde tibi pro me patienti compassus fuero. Fac domine ut exitus aquarum deducant oculi mei que per gratiam tuam sufficiant ad omnia peccata mea ablunda et diluenda. Inspira michi gratiam qua amodo perfecte ualeam mala uitare et bona
 1145 facere, tam pura et tam discreta intencione, ut merear per illa iudicium ulcionis euadere, et ad regnum beatitudinis peruenire, te prestante domine Iesu Christe rex glorie. Qui cum patre et spiritu sancto uiuis et regnas per.

<Prima inuectio.>

- Terret me domine quod tam diuites quam pauperes me religiosum esse putantes,
 1150 honorant uerbis et beneficiis et in precibus meis confidunt, cum ego pocius indigeam illorum orationibus quam illi meis. Tu ergo domine per ineffabilem pietatem tuam, fac me talem et tam dignum ut preces mee possint illis prodesse, ne illorum fiducia in me decipiatur, ne ego pro deceptioe illa in conspectu tuo confundar. Terret me domine quod deliciis utor ex labore pauperum, qui si semel
 1155 in septimana reficerentur sicut ego quando minus delicate reficior, pro magno haberent. Ideo obsecro te domine dulcissime, fac me talem et tam dignum ut orationes mee possint illos adiuuare ad gratiam tuam eis promerendam, qua paupertatem et laborem tam patienter et tam sapienter sustineant, ut ad celestes diuicias et ad requiem sempiternam mereantur peruenire. / Terret me domine quod
 199 1160 tam parum oraui, quod tam parum feci pro animabus parentum et propinquorum et amicorum meorum qui me fecerunt nutrir et instrui, sperantes quod ipsorum anime per intercessionem et merita mea apud te adiuuantur. Te ergo queso domine, fac me talem et tam dignum ut preces mee possint illis prodesse, ne fiducia eorum in me decipiatur, ne ego pro deceptioe illa in conspectu tuo confundar.
 1165 Constitue me in uia recta, et si deuiare uoluer, sepi uias meas spinis:

1165 sepi uias . . . spinis: cf. Os 2:6: 'Propter hoc ecce ego sepiam uiam tuam spinis . . .'

1134 suscipientem] suspic- R 1135 omnem] omnemque R 1135-1136 quare . . . lacrimas] om. R 1137 et] om. R 1139-1140 per ineffabilem misericordiam tuam uince duriciam meam] uince per ineffabilem misericordiam tuam meam duriciam R 1145 et] om. R 1146-1147 rex glorie] om. R 1148 Anselmus ad excitandum timorem *inscr.* R 1156 te] om. R 1157 eis promerendam] impetrandum R 1161 amicorum meorum] benefactorum nostrorum R nutrir] et custodiri *add.* R 1164 eorum] illorum R 1165 me] domine *add.* R

Percute, pelle, preme, crucia, constringe, flagella,
ure, seca, coque me et excoria et perime.

- Infer michi quamcumque uolueris penam, dummodo parcas in futuro. Constitue
me in quocumque uolueris carcere, dummodo non precipites me in Gehennam.
1170 Alibi domine, alibi ubicumque uolueris constitues me ut purges non ut dampnes.
Qui cum patre et spiritu sancto uiuis et regnas per omnia secula seculorum. Amen.

<Secunda inuectio.>

- Gratias ago tibi domine Iesu Christe qui me in nocte preterita custodire dignatus
es: set de hoc ueniam peto quod tibi non seruiui cum tanta deuocione, cum quanta
1175 potui et debui. Alii licet corpus iacerent recline paululum, te tamen sub ipso
meditabantur sopore; michi autem factus est sompnus tanquam sepultura corporis
suffocati, non requies lassi; spiritus mei extinctio, non reparacio. Alii seruierunt tibi
in uigiliis, psalmis, et ymnis, et canticis spiritalibus; ego autem tanquam porcus de
grege Epicuri totus dormiui. Ideo non merui in sompno meo tui habere memoriam,
1180 nec aliquid deuocionis uel compunctionis percipere, set impleti sunt lumbi mei
illusionibus et polluerunt me sompna uana et feda. Michi tamen dulcissime
domine pepercisti protegens me a malis quibus dignus eram, scilicet ne me grauior
egritudo opprimeret, ne mors repentina extingueret, ne inimicus suffocaret. Set
adhuc timeo domine mala que possunt hodie euenire michi, qui bona non merui.
1185 Multi surgunt mane sani et incolumes, qui ante uesperam facili de causa amittunt
sanitatem suam uel uitam. Multi surgunt / mane non proponentes aliquid crimen
p. 200 committere, et tamen ante uesperam incurrunt homicidium, uel adulterium, uel
aliud mortale peccatum. Ecce domine ad memoriam reduco miseriam meam qua
peccaui, et misericordiam tuam qua michi pepercisti, et mala que possunt hodie
1190 euenire michi; et tamen adhuc inuenio cor meum tam durum, tam aridum, ut non
possim ex eo lacrimas extorquere quas tibi in sacrificium pro innumeris excessibus
meis ualeam offerre. Hinc timens et tremens, corpus meum et animam meam,
domum nostram et fratres nostros, tibi domine committo deprecans ineffabilem
misericordiam tuam ut nos hodie in tuo sancto seruicio custodias et ab omni malo

1166-1167 Percute . . . perime: unidentified. 1178 psalmis . . . spiritalibus: cf. Eph 5:19: 'in psalmis, et hymnis, et canticis spiritalibus, cantantes et psallentes in cordibus vestris Domino'; see also Col 3:16. 1178-1179 porcus de grege Epicuri: cf. Horace, *Ep.* 1.4.16: 'Epicuri de grege porcum' (*Q. Horati Flacci Opera*, ed. S. Borzsak [Leipzig, 1984], p. 239).

1166-1167 Percute, pelle, preme, crucia, constringe, flagella, / ure, seca, coque me et excoria, et perime] Percute, pelle, preme, coque, sicca, excoria, / crucia, constringe, flagella, vre, seca, perime
R 1168 quamcumque uolueris penam] quascumque uolueris penas R 1170 constitues] -stitue
R 1177 extinctio] extractio R 1178 spiritalibus] spiritual- R 1182 domine] om. R
1183 mors] mora R 1185 incolumes] -colimes R 1186 suam] om. R 1188 aliud]
aliquod R 1194 sancto] om. R

- 1195 defendas. Perfunde domine ariditatem mentis mee rore benedictionis tue. Respice duriciam cordis mei oculis misericordie quibus respexisti Petrum, qui a te respectus fleuit amare. Da michi domine spiritum gratie salutaris, rorem superne benedictionis, gratiam compunctionis, fontem lacrimarum, spacium penitentiae, emendationem uite, consolationem spiritus sancti, executionem sancti propositi, feruorem celestis desiderii, amorem uirtutum, odium uiciorum, tantam tue dilectionis dulcedinem et tam perfectum tue uisionis desiderium ut cupiam dissolui et tecum esse in regno tuo. Qui cum patre et spiritu sancto uiuis et regnas deus per omnia secula seculorum. Amen.

University of Nebraska, Lincoln.

1196 Petrum: see Mt 26:75. 1201-1202 dissolui et tecum esse: cf. Phil 1:23: 'desiderium habens dissolui, et esse cum Christo . . .'

1196 mei] *om. R* 1199 spiritus sancti] *transp. R* executionem] *exultationem R* 1201 tue uisionis] *transp. R*

DIVERSE ORDERINGS OF DIONYSIUS'S *TRIPLEX VIA* BY ST. THOMAS AQUINAS

Michael B. Ewbank

I

ST. THOMAS AQUINAS's appropriation of the notions of *via causalitatis*, *via negationis*, and *via eminentiae* has rarely received sustained attention. The philological aspects and historical background of the *tres viae* have been well documented.¹ However, commentators on Aquinas's doctrine have often treated the notions as an incidental aspect of his overall strategy regarding predication and the divine attributes.² Some have extended a particular ordering of the notions of affirmation or causality, negation, remotion or ablation, and eminence or excellence into further dimensions of metaphysical analysis. These emphasise this same order to portray how the act of being may be separated from its finite modes.³

¹ Consult Harry A. Wolfson, 'St. Thomas on Divine Attributes' in *Mélanges offerts à Étienne Gilson* (Toronto, 1959), pp. 673-700. Wolfson offers further historical documentation in the following studies: 'The Aristotelian Predicables and Maimonides' Division of Attributes' in *Essays and Studies in Memory of Linda R. Miller* (New York, 1938), pp. 201-234; 'Maimonides on Negative Attributes' in *Louis Ginzberg Jubilee Volume* (New York, 1945), pp. 411-46; 'Albinus and Plotinus on Divine Attributes', *Harvard Theological Review* 45 (1952) 115-30; 'Avicenna, Algazali, and Averroes on Divine Attributes' in *Homenaje a Millás-Vallicrosa*, 2 vols. (Barcelona, 1954-56), 2.545-71; and 'Negative Attributes in the Church Fathers and the Gnostic Basilides', *Harvard Theological Review* 50 (1957) 145-56.

² Influential textbooks have emphasised the order of causality, remotion, and eminence, treated below as order B, as the central portrayal offered by St. Thomas. See Henri Renard, *The Philosophy of God* (Milwaukee, 1951), p. 59, and Michel Grison, *Théologie naturelle ou théodicée* (Paris, 1962), especially part 2, chapter 1. Even some detailed reflections on Aquinas's doctrine have focussed exclusively on this order. See Eleuthère Winance, 'L'essence divine et la connaissance humaine dans le *Commentaire sur les Sentences* de Saint Thomas', *Revue philosophique de Louvain* 55 (1957) 171-215, especially 180-84; and Bernard Lonergan, 'The Natural Desire to See God' in *Collection: Papers by Bernard Lonergan, S.J.*, ed. Frederick E. Crowe (New York, 1967), p. 85. A list of texts containing St. Thomas's orderings of Dionysius's notions is given at the end of this essay. Dates in parentheses are derived from determinations offered by James A. Weisheipl, *Friar Thomas d'Aquino. His Life, Thought, and Work* (Washington, 1983), pp. 358-405.

³ An original application may be encountered in Frederick D. Wilhelmsen, 'The *Triplex Via* and the Transcendence of *Esse*', *The New Scholasticism* 44 (1970) 223-35, especially 227-30. A more cautious linking of Aquinas's notion of metaphysical 'separation' with Dionysius's 'removal' is offered by Robert W. Schmidt, 'The Use of Separation in Metaphysics', *Proceedings of the Jesuit Philosophical Association* 20 (1958) 10-33, especially p. 28; translated as 'L'emploi de la séparation en

Seldom does one encounter a detailed examination of the interrelations of the notions as found in Aquinas's doctrine.⁴ Even more exceptional are efforts to explain the manifest alterations of the order of the notions offered by St. Thomas in diverse texts.⁵ Were these diverse orderings deliberately executed by St. Thomas? If so, why does he select the particular ordering of the notions in each context? Is it possible, rather, that there is no special significance in the orders which he portrays? Do the differences merely reflect the interval between memory's recall and the quill's recording?

Certainly, Étienne Gilson did not think so. In the context of a reflection on Dionysius in his *Le thomisme*, Gilson considered how and why St. Thomas altered the order of the *triplex via cognoscendi* offered in the exposition of Pseudo-Dionysius's *On the Divine Names*.⁶ Following an observation made by Jean Durantal, Gilson noted that in his commentary on the *Sentences* of Peter Lombard, St. Thomas inverted the order of the notions from that found in the *Divine Names*. Instead of ablation, excess, and causality, in the *Sentences* there is presented causality, remotion, and eminence.⁷

métaphysique', *Revue philosophique de Louvain* 58 (1960) 373-93, especially p. 389. Regarding the terminology of 'remotion' and 'ablation', see below note 27. Other commentators, however, have failed to emphasise the distinctiveness of St. Thomas's utilisation of the notions. 'Typisch für den dreifachen Sinn des Aufgehobenseins ist eine Stelle bei Thomas von Aquin, wo er zeigt, in welchem Sinne die verschiedenen Vollkommenheiten wie sapientia, bonitas, iustitia usw. in Gott verwirklicht sind.... Damit sind wir gleichzeitig auf die in der Scholastik übliche dreifache Prädikationsweise der *via affirmationis*, *negationis* und *eminentiae* gestoßen, die wohl am besten den Sinn des Aufgehobenseins bei Plotin und Hegel veranschaulicht' (Klaus Kremer, *Die neuplatonische Seinsphilosophie und ihre Wirkung auf Thomas von Aquin* [Leiden, 1966], p. 69). Finally, even when it is recognised that St. Thomas's utilisation of negative theology is not 'una pura ripetizione' of Dionysius, there is typically only a consideration of what is here designated order B. Cf. Giovanni Bortolaso, 'Originalità della teologia negativa secondo Tommaso d'Aquino' in *Tommaso d'Aquino nel suo settimo Centenario. Atti del congresso internazionale (Rome-Naples, 1976)*, 3.113-16, especially p. 116.

⁴ Very rarely considered is the relation of the *via negationis* to the other *viae* in terms of metaphysics and mystical theology. Cf. Jacques Maritain, *Les degrés du savoir*, printed in *Jacques et Raïssa Maritain: Oeuvres complètes*, 4 vols. (Paris-Fribourg, 1983), 4.688-94. In contrast, in a study devoted entirely to St. Thomas's *Divine Names* exposition, Walter M. Neidl offers precise, yet very limited remarks concerning Aquinas's development of remotion. See *Thearchia: Die Frage nach dem Sinn von Gott bei Pseudo-Dionysius Areopagita und Thomas von Aquin* (Regensburg, 1976), pp. 426-34.

⁵ Jean Durantal was content to remark that 'parfois il ne cite que le procédé par rémotion ... et parfois seulement celui par éminence' (*Saint Thomas et le Pseudo-Denys* [Paris, 1918], p. 118).

⁶ Étienne Gilson, *Le thomisme* (Paris, 1974), pp. 163-66.

⁷ *ibid.*, p. 165. Regarding Durantal, see *Saint Thomas et le Pseudo-Denys*, p. 188. There, he refers to a parallel treatment in Aquinas's *De Trinitate* 1.2, which will be treated below as pertaining to order E. In turn, Gilson's observations were transmitted by Jean Vanneste, *Le mystère de Dieu: Essai sur la structure rationnelle de la doctrine mystique du Pseudo-Denys l'Aréopagite* (Brussels, 1959), p. 113, note 1; and Marie-Dominique Chenu, *Introduction à l'étude de saint Thomas d'Aquin* (Paris, 1974), p. 195, note 1.

Gilson's purpose in highlighting this alteration was to reveal how Aquinas surpassed Dionysius's assimilation of being to the One, yet was able to preserve the integrity of his exposition of a revered authority. Essentially, Gilson's lucid portrayal is the following. Dionysius, although imbued with Plotinian procedures, nonetheless went beyond his doctrinal sources due to his concern with the God of *Exodus*. He could not acquiesce with Plotinus's essential doctrine in which the One is the first principle of everything that is, yet is not itself a being. Being, properly speaking, only makes its appearance in the universal hierarchy with Intelligence, which is the first being, the second hypostasis, and the first god.

Dionysius was thus confronted with betraying either Plotinus or Sacred Scripture. To accept Plotinus *tout court* would mean that the God of *Exodus* is identical with the One, which is to raise God above being. However, as Dionysius realised, being is among the least inappropriate of all divine names. On the other hand, to identify the God of Scripture with being in the context of Plotinus's doctrine would grant Him a rank inferior to the One. Neither alternative was acceptable.

As Gilson argued, Dionysius's tactic for dealing with his sources inevitably led him to grant a preeminence to negative theology. Considered in Himself, God is identified with the One. As perfect simplicity transcending the order of number, the One precedes being, yet contains within itself all which it is not. Since being is not the One, it will be designated the 'being of existing things'. In contrast, if the First Principle is designated in regard to its creative fecundity as source of all created processions, it is termed the Good or Optimum. In this focus, the First Principle is the supreme 'non-being' by way of excess, not defect. To speak of being *à propos* of God is not to speak of Him but of His effect, for God only appears under the aspect of being as its cause. Being is only the theophany or manifestation of the One, and the latter is not entangled in the order of its participations.

This breach between the order of being and its principle, Gilson argued, results in a confinement of the latter to 'superexistentiality' and a 'de-existentialisation' of the notion of creation. Dionysius's principles do not permit one to conclude that creation consists in a relation between beings and Being, for the creative cause, as such, cannot be known from created beings. Rather, one can only begin from things and arrive at a kind of knowledge of the divine ideas. In contrast, in the doctrine of St. Thomas Aquinas, God is presented as 'superessee' because He is superlatively being.⁸

There can be no quarrel with Gilson's basic presentation, especially since it focusses on the fifth chapter of the *Divine Names*. It should be noted, though, that St. Thomas is sensitive to the shifts of focus in Dionysius's presentation. When the divine ideas or *paradigmata* are considered as related to caused beings, they are

⁸ Gilson, *Le thomisme*, p. 166.

viewed as existing. This establishes a relational consideration of created beings with their exemplars in a way which separates the latter from being considered 'in' the Divine Being, which is their metaphysical *locus*. In this focus, the paradigms are viewed in the economy of the Dionysian Thearchy as principles and causes which presuppose a priority of the perfection of existence in the order of created participations. Within this frame of reference, the *paradigmata* are not God.⁹ Considered in relation to caused beings, the First Entity is both the cause of that which is, and 'segregated supersubstantially from all things', which is what Dionysius means when he refers to the 'unparticipable' God.¹⁰

It is sufficient to note that when Dionysius's presentation oscillates between these differing metaphysical focusses, St. Thomas's exposition faithfully reflects the shifts of reference without, however, undermining the unity of his own doctrine.¹¹ Nonetheless, what is pertinent here is Gilson's indication about Aquinas's alteration of the Dionysian *triplex via*. Gilson emphasised particularly St. Thomas's reordering as found in his commentary on the first book of the *Sentences*. It is this order which has been advanced in subsequent analyses put forth by others to extend the *triplex via* into the area of the negative judgment of the relative separation of *esse*.¹² As already indicated, this order is also generally assumed to represent St. Thomas's main utilisation of the notions. However, this position may

⁹ Consult *De div. nom.* 5.1; Dionysius ## 266-267. References to Dionysius's text and St. Thomas's exposition are from *In librum beati Dionysii De divinis nominibus expositio*, ed. Ceslas Pera (Turin, 1950). Any emphases in quotations are presented as found in the text. The effort of Dionysius to describe the divine ideas as both *προορισμοί* and *θελήματα* prompted Vladimir Lossky to conclude that: 'Les idées ne sont pas contenues dans l'Essence divine, elles ne sont pas l'Essence de Dieu "secundum quod ad alia comparatur", mais les principes divers selon lesquels les *δυνάμεις* manifestent dans la créature Dieu, dont l'Essence est inexprimable.' Vladimir Lossky, 'La notion des "analogies" chez Denys le Pseudo-Aréopagite', *Archives d'histoire doctrinale et littéraire du moyen âge* 5 (1930) 279-309, especially p. 285.

¹⁰ *De div. nom.* 2.3; Dionysius # 51; St. Thomas # 165; also, see Dionysius # 425; St. Thomas ## 934-937. The terminology is reminiscent of Proclus's manner of referring to the One and Good as 'unparticipable'. See the remarks of André-Jean Festugière in his notes to Proclus's *Commentaire sur le Timée*, 2 vols. (Paris, 1967), 2.361, note 20. Also, see *De div. nom.* 1.1; Dionysius # 9; St. Thomas ## 32-35.

¹¹ Gilson, *Le thomisme*, p. 165, note 1. Regarding the sources for Dionysius's three-fold way of knowing, one may supplement the studies of Wolfson mentioned above with the following: Proclus: *Théologie platonicienne*, eds. Henri-Dominique Saffrey and Leendert Gerrit Westerink, 5 vols. (Paris, 1968-87), 1.38:18-25, and accompanying notes on pp. 98-99; Jean Daniélou, *Message évangélique et culture hellénistique aux II^e et III^e siècles* (Tournai, 1961), pp. 313-16; and André-Jean Festugière, *La révélation d'Hermès Trismégiste*, 4 vols. (Paris, 1944-54), 4.92-100. Concerning the influence of Proclus's commentary on Plato's *Parmenides* on Dionysius, consult Saffrey, 'Un lien objectif entre le Pseudo-Denys et Proclus', *Studia Patristica* 9 (1966) 98-105, 'New Objective Links Between the Pseudo-Dionysius and Proclus' in *Neoplatonism and Christian Thought*, ed. Dominic J. O'Meara (Albany, 1982), pp. 64-74 and 246-48.

¹² See note 3 above. While Wilhelmsen does not refer to this text, his development rests on what is here designated as order B of the Dionysian notions.

not be tenable if a consideration is made of other orderings found in Aquinas's writings.¹³

II

Order A designates the order found in the exposition on the *Divine Names*. The context is the following:

Non ergo cognoscimus Deum, videntes Eius essentiam, sed cognoscimus Ipsum ex ordine totius universi. Ipsa enim universitas creaturarum est nobis a Deo proposita ut per eam Deum cognoscamus, inquantum universum ordinatum habet *quasdam imagines et assimilationes imperfectas divinorum* quae comparantur ad ipsas sicut principalia exemplaria ad imagines. Sic ergo ex ordine universi, sicut quadam *via et ordine, ascendimus* per intellectum, *secundum* nostram *virtutem* ad Deum, qui *est super omnia*; et hoc tribus modis: primo quidem et principaliter *in omnium ablatione*, inquantum scilicet nihil horum quae in creaturarum ordine inspicimus, Deum aestimamus aut Deo conveniens; secundo vero per excessum: non enim creaturarum perfectiones ut vitam, sapientiam et huiusmodi, Deo auferimus propter defectum Dei, sed propter hoc quod omnem perfectionem creaturae excedit, propterea removemus ab Eo sapientiam, quia omnem sapientiam excedit; tertia, secundum causalitatem omnium dum consideramus quod quidquid est in creaturis a Deo procedit sicut a Causa. Sic ergo nostra cognitio, contrario modo se habet cognitioni Dei: nam Deus creaturas quidem per suam naturam cognoscit, nos autem Deum per creaturas.¹⁴

A few paragraphs later, St. Thomas encapsulates the thrust of what Dionysius is stating in the passage referred to by Gilson:

[Dionysius] dicit ergo primo quod quia a creaturis in Deum ascendimus et *in omnium ablatione et excessu et in omnium causa*, propterea *Deus cognoscitur in omnibus*, sicut ab omnibus remotus et omnia excedens; et propter hoc etiam *cognoscitur Deus per cognitionem* nostram, quia quidquid in nostra cognitione cadit, accipimus ut ab Eo adductum; et iterum cognoscitur *per ignorantiam* nostram, inquantum scilicet hoc ipsum est Deum cognoscere, quod nos scimus nos ignorare de Deo quid sit.¹⁵

The Dionysian text which St. Thomas is commenting on is brief. After noting that God knows beings through knowledge of Himself, and not through knowledge of beings, Dionysius continues:

¹³ The texts to be examined in regard to different presentations of the Dionysian *viae* are not conveniently listed in any available research tool. Some may be encountered in the *Index thomisticus* (Stuttgart-Bad Cannstatt, 1974-80). Consult entries 'ablatio' and 'eminentia' in *Sectio II: Concordantia prima*. Similar results are obtained with Petri de Bergamo, *Tabula aurea* (Rome, 1960), under entries 185 and 187 on p. 317; Ludwig Schütz, *Thomas-Lexikon* (Paderborn, 1895), section c, p. 848; Roy J. Deferrari et alia, *A Lexikon of St. Thomas Aquinas* (Washington, 1948), under *vias*.

¹⁴ *In div. nom.* 7.4, # 729.

¹⁵ *In div. nom.* 7.4, # 731.

Praeterea inquirere oportet quomodo nos cognoscimus Deum neque intelligibilem neque sensibilem neque aliquid universaliter existentium existentem. Numquid igitur verum est dicere quoniam Deum cognoscimus, non ex natura Ipsius? Ignotum enim est hoc et omnem rationem et mentem excedens; sed ex omnium totorum ordinatione, sicut ex Ipso proposita et imagines quasdam et assimilationes divinatorum Ipsius exemplarium habente, ad illud quod est super omnia via et ordine secundum virtutem ascendimus, in omnium ablatione et excessu et in omnium causa.¹⁶

It should be noted that St. Thomas offers here no alteration or rectification of Dionysius. Does this mean that Aquinas is in accord with Dionysius's ordering of the *triplex via* in terms of Dionysius's focus?

This seems to be the case. If St. Thomas had desired to establish a better ordering, he could have taken the opportunity to accomplish this with discretion. In other contexts, St. Thomas benignly interprets Dionysius in order to manifest the underlying accord of his texts with Catholic doctrine. Examples are not difficult to locate: creation is not sharply distinguished from auto-causation; the notion of 'good' is not emphatically linked with the order of final causality, but rather is merged with efficient causality; and the notion of *eros* is merged with that of *agape*.¹⁷

Also, it should be remarked that Dionysius entertains no need to demonstrate God's existence, which is taken as granted. His program for knowledge moves within an order founded on revealed truth. As René Roques affirms, Dionysius admits of but two theological orientations: the symbolic, which presupposes an initiation through baptism, and which permits one to 'subsist divinely'; and that of the demonstrative method, which is only properly revealed by the *theologoi*, since in Dionysius's view strictly profane philosophers are incapable of arriving at a knowledge of the true God. For this reason, demonstrative method must be assimilated into revelation.¹⁸

Finally, it is necessary to consider certain aspects of Dionysius's method. In the affirmative or cataphatic movement, the human intelligence applies to God intel-

¹⁶ *In div. nom.* 7.4, Dionysius ## 320-321.

¹⁷ For an example of St. Thomas setting the authority of Dionysius against those who denied that God produces 'ex liberalitate voluntatis', consult *Scriptum super libros Sententiarum magistri Petri Lombardi* 2. prol. (ed. Mandonnet, 2.2). For a survey of interpretations concerning deliberate versus automatic causation in Dionysius's doctrines, see Stephen Gersh, *From Iamblichus to Eriugena: An Investigation of the Prehistory and Evolution of the Pseudo-Dionysian Tradition* (Leiden, 1978), pp. 20-23. Regarding Dionysius's utilisation of the notion of 'good', consult Julien Peghaire, 'L'axiome "Bonum est diffusivum sui" dans le néo-platonisme et le thomisme', *Revue de l'Université d'Ottawa, Section spéciale* 1 (1932) 5-30. Finally, regarding Dionysius's vocabulary when discussing eros and agape, see René Roques, *L'univers dionysien* (Paris, 1983), pp. 59-64 and 114.

¹⁸ René Roques, *Structures théologiques: De la gnose à Richard de Saint-Victor* (Paris, 1962), pp. 140, 148. Consult the careful exposition of Dionysius's text on this topic by Aquinas: *In div. nom.* 4.9, and the observations of Pera on pp. 138-140.

ligible names applicable to created beings: Good, Being, Life, Wisdom, Power, etc. Each relates to God as cause and exemplar in terms of the processions, theophanies or hierarchies *ad extra*, which 'descend' from God. The apophatic movement complements the cataphatic dialectic and is one with the ascent or conversion of the soul through the created Thearchy in terms of negations of negations. The conditions of the descending dialectic fix those of the ascending dialectic, of conversion and ascent. There is a correlation and reciprocity between the two.

In fact, St. Thomas allows Dionysius's order as elaborated here to stand without alteration because he interprets it as a description of knowledge founded on what transcends natural inquiry. God's existence is assumed.¹⁹ The text principally concerns a contemplative knowledge of God which presupposes an active purification of the knowing powers. Such a purification may yield experiential knowledge of God's causality. This interpretation is reinforced by the presence of terms in Aquinas's exposition which refer to 'union' with and 'illumination' by the divine:

*Rursus autem est alia perfectissima Dei cognitio, per remotionem scilicet, qua cognoscimus Deum per ignorantiam, per quamdam unionem ad divina supra naturam mentis, quando scilicet mens nostra recedens ab omnibus aliis et postea etiam dimittens seipsam unitur supersplendentibus radiis Deitatis, inquantum scilicet cognoscit Deum esse non solum super omnia quae sunt infra ipsam, sed etiam supra ipsam et supra omnia quae ab ipsa comprehendi possunt. Et sic cognoscens Deum, in tali statu cognitionis, illuminatur ab ipsa profunditate divinae Sapientiae, quam perscrutari non possumus.*²⁰

It is with reason that Reginald Garrigou-Lagrange asserted the following about this chapter of Aquinas's exposition of Dionysius's *Divine Names*: 'It would be a gross

¹⁹ A similar presentation of the Dionysian notions is found in *De potentia* 9.7 arg. 2. The issue concerns in what manner numeration may be predicated of the divine persons.

²⁰ *In div. nom.* 7.4, # 732. Compare this with *Summa theologiae* 2-2.180.3, where Aquinas makes an explicit reference to this chapter of the *Divine Names* to elaborate on the difference between human and angelic contemplation: 'Haec est autem differentia inter hominem et angelum, ut patet per Dionysium, 7 cap. *De div. nom.*, quod angelus simplici apprehensione veritatem intuetur, homo autem quodam processu ex multis pertingit ad intuitum simplicis veritatis.' Such a consideration is preliminary to examining how contemplation is possessed imperfectly in the present life, and perfectly only as terminated 'in futuro' when the contemplative life will principally concern 'divine truth' and only secondarily 'divine effects' (*ST* 2-2.180.4; compare *In II ad corinthios* 12.1, ## 447-51).

Further: '... quando anima nostra Deo conformata immittit se rebus divinis, non immissione oculorum corporalium, sed immissione fidei, scilicet per hoc quod divinum lumen ignotum et inaccessibile, seipsum nobis unit et communicat. Dum enim consideramus ea quae fidei sunt, non diiudicamus ea per rationem naturalem' (*In div. nom.* 4.9, # 414). Thus: 'Secundo etiam resplendet in eis puritas ex dono divinitus eis dato per quod uniuntur ad Deum; per quod quidem donum, secundum eorum possibilitatem, intendunt ad divinum, idest ad hoc ipsum quod Deus est, ad divinam mentem et rationem, quae omnem sapientiam excedit.' This takes place 'ex dono divinae gratiae' (*In div. nom.* 7.2, # 712).

error to confound this infused contemplation with the philosophical meditation in which one thinks that the divine essence surpasses all our concepts.'²¹

III

Given the preceding, what is the reason for the alteration presented in Aquinas's commentary on the *Sentences*? This order, here designated B, was referred to by Gilson and others as indicating a significant transformation of Dionysius's doctrine by St. Thomas. It should be observed that the text of distinction 3 written by Peter Lombard in Book 1 of the *Sentences* includes no mention of Dionysius. However, this should not lead us to conclude that St. Thomas was the first to relate Lombard's text to Dionysius's *viae*. Both Alexander of Hales and St. Albert the Great had used the text as an occasion to refer to the three modes of knowing taken from the seventh chapter of the *Divine Names*. However, both applied them without any alteration of the order.²²

The text written by Peter Lombard is a compilation of what he calls *rationes* or manners in which God can be known.²³ Different arguments are taken primarily from two sources, writings of St. Augustine and a work erroneously attributed to St. Ambrose. First, he presents a view extracted in part from the *Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans* of the Pseudo-Ambrose.

Nam, sicut ait Ambrosius, 'ut Deus, qui natura invisibilis est, etiam a visibilibus posset sciri, opus fecit quod opificem visibilitate sui manifestavit, ut per certum incertum posset sciri, et ille Deus omnium esse crederetur, qui hoc fecit quod ab homine impossibile est fieri.' Potuerunt ergo cognoscere sive cognoverunt ultra omnem creaturam esse illum, qui ea fecit quae nulla creaturarum facere vel destruere valet.... Sed quia nulla creatura talia facere potest, constat supra omnem creaturam esse illum qui ea fecit; ac per hoc illum esse Deum humana mens cognoscere potuit.²⁴

Aquinas's comments on this include the observation that this first argument presented by Lombard proceeds 'by way of causality'.

Primo ratio sumitur per viam causalitatis, et formatur sic. Omne quod habet esse ex nihilo, oportet quod sit ab aliquo a quo esse suum fluxerit. Sed omnes creaturae habent esse ex nihilo: quod manifestatur ex earum imperfectione et potentialitate. Ergo oportet quod sint ab aliquo uno primo, et hoc est Deus.²⁵

²¹ Reginald Garrigou-Lagrange, *Perfection chrétienne et contemplation selon S. Thomas d'Aquin et S. Jean de la Croix* (Saint Maxim, 1923), p. 40.

²² Alexander of Hales, 1 *Sent.* 3.D.9 (Quaracchi, 1.38-39); St. Albert, 1 *Sent.* 3.D.9 (Borgnet, 25.99a-100b).

²³ '... ratio vel modus potuit cognosci Deus' (Peter Lombard, 1 *Sent.* 3, *Sententiae in iv libris distinctae*, tomus 1, pars 2, liber 1 et 2 [Rome, 1971], 1.69).

²⁴ *ibid.*

²⁵ 1 *Sent.* 3 div. prim. par. (Mandonnet, 1.88).

Lombard's second argument is taken from St. Augustine's *City of God*:

Ut enim Augustinus ait in libro *De civitate Dei* (8.6), 'viderunt summi philosophi nullum corpus esse Deum, et ideo cuncta corpora transcenderunt quaerentes Deum. Viderunt etiam quidquid mutabile est non esse summum Deum omniumque principium, et ideo omnem animam mutabilesque spiritus transcenderunt. Deinde viderunt omne quod mutabile est non posse esse nisi ab illo qui incommutabiliter et simpliciter est. Intellexerunt igitur eum et omnia ista fecisse et a nullo fieri potuisse.'²⁶

St. Thomas remarks that this is an argument which proceeds 'by way of remotion'.

Secunda ratio sumitur per viam remotionis, et est talis. Ultra omne imperfectum oportet esse aliquod perfectum, cui nulla imperfectio admisceatur. Sed corpus est quod imperfectum, quia est terminatum et finitum suis dimensionibus et mobile. Ergo oportet ultra corpora esse aliquid quod non est corpus. Item, omne incorporeum mutabile de sui natura est imperfectum. Ergo ultra omnes species mutabiles, sicut sunt animae et angeli, oportet esse aliquod ens incorporeum et immobile et omnino perfectum, et hoc est Deus.²⁷

The third argument reported by Peter Lombard is again taken from St. Augustine's *City of God*, as well as his *On Eighty-three Different Questions*.

Consideraverunt [philosophi] etiam quidquid est in substantiis vel corpus esse vel spiritum, meliusque aliquid spiritum esse quam corpus, sed longe meliorem qui spiritum fecit et corpus.²⁸

St. Thomas affirms here that the procedure is 'by way of eminence'. However, eminence can be understood in two ways, either according to *esse* or according to knowledge. In this instance, the procedure is by way of eminence according to *esse*.

Aliae duae rationes sumuntur per viam eminentiae. Sed potest dupliciter attendi eminentia, vel quantum ad esse vel quantum ad cognitionem. Tertia ergo sumitur ratio per viam eminentiae in esse, et est talis. Bonum et melius dicuntur per comparisonem ad optimum. Sed in substantiis invenimus corpus bonum et spiritum creatum melius, in quo tamen bonitas non est a seipso. Ergo oportet esse aliquod optimum a quo sit bonitas in utroque.²⁹

²⁶ 1 *Sent.* 3 (Rome, 1.69).

²⁷ 1 *Sent.* 3 div. prim. par. (Mandonnet, 1.88-89). Concerning the equation of 'negation' and 'remotion' by St. Thomas and the further equation of 'privation' with the former, though in a restricted sense, consult Wolfson, 'St. Thomas on Divine Attributes', 497-502. The *Oxford English Dictionary* indicates that 'ablation' is enhanced by recent scientific usage, while 'remotion' is now rare (*OED*, and the *OED Supplement*, s.v.). Nonetheless, as a philosophical and theological term 'remotion' should offer no difficulty.

²⁸ 1 *Sent.* 3 (Rome, 1.69).

²⁹ 1 *Sent.* 3 div. prim. par. (Mandonnet, 1.89).

The final or fourth argument given by the Lombard is again derived from St. Augustine's *City of God*:

[Philosophi] intellexerunt etiam corporis speciem esse sensibilem et spiritus speciem intelligibilem, et intelligibilem speciem sensibili praetulerunt. Sensibilia dicimus, quae visu tactuque corporis sentiri queunt; intelligibilia, quae conspectu mentis intelligi. Cum igitur in eorum conspectu et corpus et animus magis minusque speciosa essent, si autem omni specie carere possent, omnino nulla essent, viderunt esse aliquid quo illa speciosa facta sunt, ubi est prima et incommutabilis species, ideoque incomparabilis; et illud esse rerum principium rectissime crediderunt, quod factum non esset et ex quo cuncta facta essent.³⁰

Aquinas asserts that this argument proceeds by way of eminence in the order of knowledge or consideration:

Quarta sumitur per eminentiam in cognitione, et est talis. In quibuscumque est invenire magis et minus speciosum, est invenire aliquod speciositatis principium, per cujus propinquitatem aliud alio dicitur speciosius. Sed invenimus corpora esse speciosa sensibili specie, spiritus autem speciosiores specie intelligibili. Ergo oportet esse aliquid a quo utraque speciosa sint, cui spiritus creati magis appropinquant.³¹

Finally, in reference to distinction 3, St. Thomas relates the ordering of the Dionysian *viae* to the analogy of similarity.

... cum creatura exemplariter procedat ab ipso Deo sicut a causa quodammodo simili per analogiam, ex creaturis potest in Deum deveniri tribus illis modis quibus dictum est, scilicet per causalitatem, remotionem, eminentiam.³²

Throughout this text, which was referred to by Gilson, St. Thomas follows the Lombard in his attempt to show how the unity of essence and Trinity of persons in God may be known through 'rationes et similitudines'. Immediately prior to noting the four *rationes*, St. Thomas had observed the accordance of Dionysius's *viae* with these *rationes*:

Dicit enim [Dionysius] quod ex creaturis tribus modis devenimus in Deum: scilicet per causalitatem, per remotionem, per eminentiam. Et ratio hujus est, quia esse creaturae est ab altero. Unde secundum hoc ducimur in causam a qua est. Hoc autem potest esse dupliciter. Aut quantum ad id quod receptum est; et sic ducimur per modum causalitatis: aut quantum ad modum recipiendi, quia imperfecte recipitur; et sic habemus duos modos, scilicet secundum remotionem imperfectionis a Deo et

³⁰ 1 *Sent.* 3 (Rome, 1.70).

³¹ 1 *Sent.* 3 div. prim. par. (Mandonnet, 1.89).

³² 1 *Sent.* 3.1.3 (Mandonnet, 1.96).

secundum hoc quod illud quod receptum est in creatura, perfectius et nobilius est in Creatore; et ita est modus per eminentiam.³³

As Gilson observed in a lengthy study, none of these cogent reflections in Lombard's text, nor in St. Thomas's commentary, fulfill all the canons for a strict demonstration of God's existence in terms of a demonstration *quia* by parting from something empirically given in experience. It is only subsequent to such a development that one can investigate the cause of existence of such an object and respond that a First uncaused Cause is necessary. As Gilson remarked:

Within *Sentences*, 1.3.1.3, St. Thomas starts from the analogy between creatures and God to see whether it is possible to derive a certain knowledge of God from creatures. Thus, one knows that God exists. It is therefore rather His nature which is in question, and not His existence. This is confirmed by the fact that St. Thomas invokes the authority of Dionysius to establish that God can be known *per causalitatem, remotionem, et eminentiam*.³⁴

Gilson's analysis appears to be correct, since none of these four *rationes* and their subsequent elaborations or condensations by St. Thomas offers a plenary demonstration that the First Cause exists. Even though it may be argued that such cogent arguments can be extended by elaborating on their points of departure, so that the direct apprehension of existing being through judgment is elucidated, it nonetheless remains true that such is not executed here. These texts, as considered by St. Thomas, are concerned with coming to a knowledge of God's nature, and they reflect a treatment that focusses on participated perfections. However, they presuppose the existence of the cause of those very perfections. Because of this, the implications of the order in which the Dionysian notions are herein presented by Aquinas vary significantly from those of the remaining orderings we shall consider.

Before turning to these orderings, however, three other texts which contain the order presented in the third distinction of the first book of the *Sentences* should

³³ 1 *Sent.* 3 div. prim. par. (Mandonnet, 1.88).

³⁴ Étienne Gilson, 'Trois leçons sur le problème de l'existence de Dieu', *Divinitas* 5 (1961) 23-87, especially p. 68. Gilson ends his remarks by observing: 'Ceci est confirmé par le fait que saint Thomas invoque l'autorité de Denys pour établir que Dieu peut être connu *per causalitatem, remotionem, eminentiam*. D'où la conclusion: "et ideo angelis non convenit Deum cognoscere per creaturas, neque beatis hominibus, qui a creatoris cognitione procedunt in creaturas. Sed convenit iste processus hominibus secundum statum viae, bonis et malis"' (p. 29, note 7). Concerning the expansion of these arguments to comply with Gilson's demands by elaborating on their point of departure, see Joseph Owens, 'Stages and Distinction in *De ente*: A Rejoinder', *The Thomist* 45 (1981) 99-123, especially pp. 111-16. The implications of the absence of a full demonstration of God's existence in conjunction with this ordering are not adverted to by Hampus Lyttkens, *The Analogy Between God and the World: An Investigation of Its Background and Interpretation of Its Use by Thomas of Aquinas* (Uppsala, 1952), pp. 406-408.

be briefly considered. Others, which only incidentally refer to the Dionysian notions, may be set aside.³⁵ In contrast, the following texts corroborate what has been determined thus far by offering a development which relies strongly on the *triplex via*.

In *Summa contra gentiles* 1.30, there is a consideration of the names that can be predicated of God. The concern is with how those names which properly express perfections of creatures can only be applied to God through analogy.

Et sic in omni nomine a nobis dicto, quantum ad modum significandi, imperfectio invenitur, quae Deo non competit, quamvis res significata aliquo eminenti modo Deo conveniat: ut patet in nomine *bonitatis* et *boni*; nam *bonitas* significat ut non subsistens, *bonum* autem ut concretum. Et quantum ad hoc nullum nomen Deo convenienter aptatur, sed solum quantum ad id ad quod significandum nomen imponitur. Possunt igitur, ut Dionysius docet, huiusmodi nomina et affirmari de Deo et negari: affirmari quidem, propter nominis rationem; negari vero, propter significandi modum. Modus autem supereminetiae quo in Deo dictae perfectiones inveniuntur, per nomina a nobis imposita significari non potest nisi vel per negationem, sicut cum dicimus Deum *aeternum* vel *summum bonum*. Non enim de Deo capere possumus quid est, sed quod non est, et qualiter alia se habeant ad ipsum.³⁶

Similarly, in *De potentia* 7.5 ad 2, there is a parallel development to examine whether names predicated of God signify the divine substance.

... ita Dionysius dicit negationes horum nominum esse veras de Deo ... tamen non asserit affirmationes esse falsas et incompactas: quantum enim ad rem significatam, Deo vere attribuuntur, quae in eo aliquo modo est, ut iam ostensum est; sed quantum ad modum quem significant de Deo negari possunt quodlibet enim istorum nominum significat aliquam formam definitam, et sic Deo non attribuuntur, ut dictum est. Et ideo absolute de Deo possunt negari, quia ei non conveniunt per modum qui significatur: modus enim significatus est secundum quod sunt in intellectu nostro, ut dictum est; Deo autem conveniunt sublimiori modo; unde affirmatio incompacta dicitur quasi non omnino convenienter coniuncta propter diversum modum. Et ideo, secundum doctrinam Dionysii, tripliciter ista de Deo dicuntur. Primo quidem affirmative, ut dicamus, Deus est sapiens; quod quidem de eo oportet dicere propter hoc quod est in eo similitudo sapientiae ab ipso fluentis: quia tamen non est in Deo sapientia qualem nos intelligimus et nominamus, potest vere negari, ut dicatur, Deus non est sapiens. Rursum quia sapientia non negatur de Deo quia ipse deficiat a sapientia, sed quia supereminetius est in ipso quam dicatur aut intelligatur, ideo oportet dicere quod Deus sit supersapiens.³⁷

³⁵ For example: 1 *Sent.* 22.1 obj. 2 (Mandonnet, 1.534); also, *ST* 1.8.2 ad 1.

³⁶ *Summa contra gentiles* 1.30, §§ 277-278.

³⁷ *De potentia dei* 7.5 ad 2. Durantel noted that the translation of Ioannis Scoti read 'incompactae', while that of Ioannis Saraceni used 'inconvenientes' (*Saint Thomas et le Pseudo-Denis*, p. 73). Also, consult *ST* 1.13.12 ad 1.

Finally, this group of texts should include *Summa theologiae* 1.12.12. Once again, the question is whether one can know God in this life by reason uninformed by revelation. The response focusses on the origin of natural knowledge in sensible things, and notes the inadequacy of arriving from sensible creatures to behold the divine essence. It is then affirmed that we can come to know about God *an est*, and this is followed by the affirmation that:

Unde cognoscimus de ipso habitudinem ipsius ad creaturas, quod scilicet omnium est causa; et differentiam creaturarum ab ipso, quod scilicet ipse non est aliquid eorum quae ab eo causantur; et quod haec non remouentur ab eo propter eius defectum, sed quia superexcedit.³⁸

As in the preceding texts, what characterises the application of this ordering is the fact that the existence of God is taken as already established, and that knowledge is sought of His nature.

IV

Order C, the third ordering of the Dionysian *viae*, is that of negation, causality, and eminence. Like orders B and E, this order may be found in texts that pertain to different periods of Aquinas' career. Thus, in understanding St. Thomas's consistency of application in utilising his reorderings, one can not focus merely on the chronology of contexts.

The first relevant text in this group is interesting in that the Dionysian notions are brought to bear on the question 'whether knowledge is appropriate to God'. The diverse arguments *contra* explore the contrast between *intellectus* and *scientia*. The implication of plurality within the latter renders it inappropriate in considering the divine unity. St. Thomas begins his response with a direct reliance on Dionysius's notions.

... secundum Dionysium, in lib. *De div. nom.* 7, § 3, tribus viis ex creaturis in Deum devenimus: scilicet per remotionem, per causalitem, per eminentiam, quarum quaelibet nos in Dei scientiam inducit.

Prima igitur via, quae est per remotionem est haec: cum a Deo omnis potentia et materialitas removeatur, eo quod ipse est actus primus et purus, oportet essentiam ejus esse denudatam a materia, et esse formam tantum. Sicut autem participationis principium est materia, ita formae debetur intelligibilitas: unde forma principium

³⁸ *ST* 1.12.12. All 'removal' or negation, however, is grasped through something affirmative: 'Si ergo praedicationes de Deo non essent introductae nisi ad removendum, sicut dicimus Deum esse viventem, quia non habet esse ad modum inanimatorum, ut ipse dicit, ita possemus dicere Deum esse leonem, quia non habet esse ad modum avis. Et praeterea intellectus negationis semper fundatur in aliqua affirmatione: quod ex hoc patet quia omnis negativa per affirmativam probatur; unde nisi intellectus humanus aliquid de Deo affirmative cognosceret, nihil de Deo posset negare' (*De pot.* 7.5 Secundus autem modus).

cognitionis est; unde oportet quod omnis forma per se existens separata a materia, sit intellectualis naturae: et si quidem sit per se subsistens, erit et intelligens; si autem non sit per se subsistens, sed quasi perfectio alicujus subsistentis, non erit intelligens, sed principium intelligendi: quemadmodum omnis forma non in se subsistens non operatur, sed est operationis principium, ut caliditas in igne. Cum igitur Deus sit immunis ab omni materia, et sit per se subsistens, quia esse suum ab alio non dependet, oportet quod ipse sit intelligens et sciens.

Secunda via, quae est per causalitatem, est haec. Omne enim agens habet aliquam intentionem et desiderium finis. Omne autem desiderium finis praecedit aliqua cognitio praestituens finem, et dirigens in finem ea quae sunt ad finem. Sed in quibusdam ista cognitio non est conjuncta ipsi tendenti in finem: unde oportet quod dirigatur per aliquod prius agens, sicut sagitta tendit in determinatum locum per determinationem sagittantis; et ita est in omnibus quae agunt per necessitatem naturae; quia horum operatio est determinata per intellectum aliquem instituentem naturam; unde Philosophus, II *Phys.*, 4.6, dicit, quod opus naturae est opus intelligentiae. In aliquibus autem ista cognitio est conjuncta ipsi agenti, ut patet in animalibus; unde oportet quod primum non agat per necessitatem naturae, quia sic non esset primum, sed dirigeretur ab aliquo priori intelligente. Oportet igitur quod agat per intellectum et voluntatem; et ita, quod sit intelligens et sciens.

Tertia via, quae est per eminentiam, est haec. Quod enim invenitur in pluribus magis ac magis secundum quod plures alicui appropinquant, oportet ut in illo maxime invenitur; sicut calor in igne, ad quem quanto corpora mixta magis accedunt, calidiora sunt. Invenitur autem quod quanto aliqua magis accedunt ad primum, nobilius cognitionem participant; sicut homines plus quam bruta et angeli magis homines; unde oportet quod in Deo nobilissima cognitio inveniat.³⁹

As can be seen, the appeal to the way of remotion is linked with a recognition of God as being free from materiality, as well as *per se* subsistent. The way of causality is linked to finality as pervading nature, which as an 'opus intelligentiae' is permeated with finality. Finally, in the focus of the way of eminence perfections recognized as 'magis et minus' are understood in terms of an approximation to the perfection found in what is maximal. Each way concerns a distinct attainment.

A second important text which bears this ordering is in *De trinitate* 6.3, section 5. It considers whether the human intellect can behold the divine form, thus echoing Boethian terminology. The objections that we are unable to do so in this life range from Dionysian texts to Aristotle's remark about our intellect's vespertine vision of the most intelligible things. Positions to the contrary are

³⁹ 1 *Sent.* 35.1.1 (Mandonnet, 1.808-810). The *De div. nom.* reference should be to 7.4. It should be remarked that the axiom 'opus naturae est opus intelligentiae' is not found as formulated in II *Phys.*, 4.6. James Weisheipl has shown that the axiom must be credited directly to Albert the Great, and remotely to Aristotle by way of Albert. James A. Weisheipl, 'The Axiom *Opus naturae est opus intelligentiae* and Its Origins' in *Albertus Magnus Doctor Universalis: 1280/1980*, ed. Gerbert Meyer and Albert Zimmermann (Mainz, 1980), pp. 441-63, especially p. 453.

derived from St. Paul, St. Gregory the Great, and Dionysius, each emphasising in some manner our capacity to know the divine. The response begins with the Aristotelian distinction between knowledge *an est* and *quid est*, as discussed in Aristotle's *Posterior Analytics* 2.7(92b11). It is observed that the intellect can directly conceive the quiddity of a sensible reality, but not of an intelligible reality, as Aristotle observed in the *De anima* 3.7(431a14). Thus, our intellect cannot directly penetrate either the essence of God or other separate essences. However, some invisible things are revealed by the known quiddities of sensible things, and these intelligible objects are knowable indirectly. In knowing what man and animal are, for instance, the comparative relation of one to the other may be known. Since sensible natures and the divine essence or separate essences do not pertain to one genus, the quiddities of the former cannot be predicated of the latter univocally. Nonetheless, they can be predicated 'almost equivocally' or analogically. Even granted this, in the present life it is absolutely impossible for the human intellect to know directly the essence of immaterial substances, whether by natural knowledge or through revelation.

In carrying this analysis further, an implication is drawn regarding the contrast of focusses found in logic, natural philosophy, and metaphysics. Since the logician considers concepts in themselves, nothing prevents him from viewing the immaterial and the material, or the incorruptible and corruptible, as having something in common. However, the philosopher of nature and the metaphysician treat of essences as existing in reality. Therefore, they affirm that there are different genera wherever they encounter diverse modes of potency and act. Given this, it is apparent that instead of directly knowing the genera of immaterial substances, we know them through negations. An augmentation of negations yields a corresponding diminution of vagueness or obscurity in understanding.

Ita ergo de formis immaterialibus cognoscimus an est et habemus de eis loco cognitionis quid est cognitionem per negationem, per causalitatem et per excessum, quos etiam modos Dionysius ponit in libro *De divinis nominibus*.⁴⁰

These considerations are complemented by a text in *Summa contra gentiles* 1.14, where it is determined whether it is necessary to utilise the way of remotion in order to have knowledge of God.

⁴⁰ In *Boetii De trinitate*, ed. Bruno Decker (Leiden, 1955), 6.3, sect. 5 (p. 223). In a related consideration, it is noted that although some knowledge is caused in us through revelation and without the mediation of phantasms, such is not the manner of knowing regularly exercised: '... in usu cognoscendi quamdiu in hac vita sumus, semper est nobis phantasma necessarium, quantumcumque sit spiritualis cognitio, quia etiam Deus cognoscitur a nobis per phantasma sui effectus in quantum cognoscimus Deum per negationem, vel per causalitatem, vel per excellentiam, ut Dionysius dicit in libro *De divinis nominibus*. Non tamen oportet quod omnis cognitio in nobis causetur ex phantasmatibus; quaedam enim cognitio in nobis causatur ex revelatione' (*De malo* 16.8 ad 3).

Ostenso igitur quo est aliquod primum ens, quod Deum dicimus, oportet eius conditiones investigare.

Est autem via remotionis utendum praecipue in consideratione divinae substantiae. Nam divina substantia omnem formam quam intellectus noster attingit, sua immensitate excedit: et sic ipsam apprehendere non possumus cognoscendo quid est. ...

Sed quia in consideratione substantiae divinae non possumus accipere *quid*, quasi genus; nec distinctionem eius ab aliis rebus per affirmativas differentias accipere possumus, oportet eam accipere per differentias negativas.

Sicut autem in affirmativis differentiis una aliam contrahit, et magis ad completam designationem rei appropinquat secundum quod a pluribus differre facit; ita una differentia negativa per aliam contrahitur, quae a pluribus differre facit.

Sicut, si dicamus Deum non esse accidens, per hoc ab omnibus accidentibus distinguitur; deinde si addamus ipsum non esse corpus, distinguemus ipsum etiam ab aliquibus substantiis; et sic per ordinem ab omni eo quod est praeter ipsum, per negationes huiusmodi distinguetur; et tunc de substantia eius erit propria consideratio cum cognoscetur ut ab omnibus distinctus. Non tamen erit perfecta: quia non cognoscetur quid in se sit.

Ad procedendum igitur circa Dei cognitionem per viam remotionis, accipiamus principium id quod ex superioribus iam manifestum est, scilicet quod Deus sit omnino immobilis. Quod etiam auctoritas Sacrae Scripturae confirmat.⁴¹

The same emphasis upon negation is encountered when the formulation of the question is whether our intellect can understand immaterial substances through its knowledge of material things. An objection asserts that knowledge of immaterial substances is possessed by the intellect, since immaterial substances can be defined and are treated in theology and philosophy. This demands the response that:

... de superioribus rebus in scientiis maxime tractatur per viam remotionis: sic enim corpora caelestia notificat Aristoteles (*De cael.* 1.3) per negationem proprietatum inferiorum corporum. Unde multo magis immateriales substantiae a nobis cognosci non possunt, ut earum quidditates apprehendamus: sed de eis nobis in scientiis documenta traduntur per viam remotionis, et alicuius habitudinis ad res materiales.⁴²

Finally, a parallel consideration appears in a passage from Aquinas's *Lectura super Epistolam ad romanos*. In commenting on St. Paul's reference to the 'invisibilia Dei', St. Thomas notes the following:

Primo quidem invisibilia ipsius, per quae intelligitur Dei essentia, quae, sicut dictum est ... a nobis videri non potest ... Dicit [Apostolus] autem pluraliter invisibilia quia

⁴¹ SCG 1.14, ## 116-119.

⁴² ST 1.88.2 ad 2.

Dei essentia non est nobis cognita secundum illud quod est, scilicet prout in se est una. Sic erit nobis in patria cognita, et tunc 'erit Dominus unus et nomen eius unum', ut dicitur Zacharias. Est autem manifesta nobis per quasdam similitudines in creaturis repertas, quae id quod in Deo unum est, multipliciter participant, et secundum hoc intellectus noster considerat unitatem divinae essentiae sub ratione bonitatis, sapientiae, virtutis et huiusmodi, quae in Deo unum sunt....

Aliud autem quod de Deo cognoscitur est virtus ipsius, secundum quam res ab eo procedunt, sicut a principio.... Hanc autem virtutem philosophi perpetuam esse cognoverunt, unde dicitur sempiterna quoque virtus eius.

Tertium cognitum est quod dicit et divinitas, ad quod pertinet quod cognoverunt Deum sicut ultimum finem, in quem omnia tendunt. Divinum enim bonum dicitur bonum commune quod ab omnibus participatur; propter hoc potius dixit [Apostolus] 'divinitatem', quae participationem significat, quam 'deitatem', quae significat essentiam Dei....

Haec autem tria referuntur ad tres modos cognoscendi supradictos. Nam invisibilia Dei cognoscuntur per viam negationis; sempiterna virtus, per viam causalitatis; divinitas, per viam excellentiae.⁴³

As presented in this context, the focus is upon the specific knowledge attainable through each *via*. Through the way of negation, the 'invisibilia Dei' or God's essence is considered in terms of the similitudes discernible in creatures. These participate manifoldly in what is one in God. Through the way of causality, the power of God is considered as that from which things proceed as from a principle. In turn, the way of excellence permits a consideration of God as ultimate end in terms of His divinity. The divine goodness is the common goodness participated in by all things.

Among each of the texts in this group there is a common reference. Negation is preeminent when one proceeds to a more specific knowledge of immaterial substances. St. Thomas had already remarked in *Summa contra gentiles* 1.13 that when it is a question of attaining knowledge of God's properties, one must proceed in a way that grants priority to the *via remotionis*. An establishment of any negative difference between creatures and God leads to a more precise recognition of the difference between God and all that He is not. Only in this manner may a 'propria consideratio' of God's substance be made. Even then, the knowledge will not be perfect enough to know what God is in Himself.⁴⁴

For this reason, the subsequent fifteen chapters of the *Summa contra gentiles* proceed to apply the *via negationis* in order to determine that God is: eternal (15); no passive potency (16); not material (17); not composed (18); not subject to violence (19); not corporeal (20); not different from His essence (21); not a being in which *esse* differs from essence (22); not a being admitting accidents (23); and

⁴³ In *1 Ad romanos* 6, # 117.

⁴⁴ 'Non tamen erit perfecta: quia non cognoscetur qui in se sit' (*SCG* 1.14, # 118).

so on. Such would indicate, by extension, that in any reflective analysis of the immanent activities of God the preeminent way of consideration would be the *via negationis* as well. Indeed, it is this manner of proceeding which is refined in *Summa theologiae* 1, questions three through eleven.

V

Order D is a direct inversion of order C. It is clearly applied in *Summa theologiae* 1.13.8 ad 2. The question is whether the name 'God' is of His nature.⁴⁵ The response takes its point of departure from the distinction between the 'id a quo' and the 'id ad quod' of a word, the 'id a quo' implying that which is signified by the etymology. Aquinas does not reiterate here what he had affirmed earlier in *De veritate* 4.1 ad 8, that is, that the 'a quo' of the name can be understood either from the point of view of the one imposing the term, and thus may be opposed to the 'id ad quod', or from the point of view of the thing, 'ex parte re'. In this view, the 'id a quo' is the specific difference of what the name properly signifies.

Rather, in this context, he concentrates on examples whose 'id a quo' and 'id ad quod' are identical,⁴⁶ which occurs when names or terms are imposed from that which is known through the senses, as when we come to an understanding of a substance through its properties and operations. Aquinas gives the examples of hot, cold, rough, and smooth, as not being denominated through something more manifest. Rather, other things are denominated in terms of these. In contrast, the name 'God' is imposed from His operations or effects, particularly His providence for all things.

In the *ad secundum* St. Thomas recalls Aristotle's doctrine of signification: the word signifies the thing indirectly through a conception of the mind, and this conception directly signified by the word is designated 'ratio'. Since the concern is whether the name 'God' is the name of His nature, he recalls that 'the conception which the name signifies is the definition', and refers us to Aristotle's *Metaphysics* 4.7(1012a21-24; St. Thomas, 16, # 733). He concludes by stating:

Sed ex effectibus divinis divinam naturam non possumus cognoscere secundum quod in se est, ut sciamus de ea 'quid est'; sed per modum eminentiae et causalitatis et negationis, ut supra (I.12.12) dictum est. Et sic hoc nomen 'Deus' significat naturam

⁴⁵ Regarding the restricted signification of 'nomen' as 'noun' to indicate substance or quality and its broad meaning to indicate 'word', see *In 1 Perihermias* 5.15.

⁴⁶ An early discussion which anticipates the focus upon 'id a quo' and 'id ad quod' is 1 *Sent.* 2.1/3 (Mandonnet, 1.66-69). Noted there is the relation of an exclusive emphasis on negation and causality with Moses Maimonides' radical position that all divine names are equivocal. The inclusion of eminence is related to the positions of Dionysius and St. Anselm for whom divine names are admitted to signify the divine substance, although imperfectly. The treatment prefigures *De pot.* 7.5. Consult Ralph M. McInerney, *The Logic of Analogy: An Interpretation of St. Thomas* (The Hague, 1961), pp. 156-61.

divinam. Impositum est enim nomen hoc ad aliquid significandum supra omnia existens, quod est principium omnium, et remotum ab omnibus.⁴⁷

In this ordering, which is the inversion of the previous one, the focus is directly upon the name 'God'. The consideration is upon its signification of the divine nature as eminently existing and causing all things, yet removed from any admixture of imperfection encountered in what is caused *ad extra*. The designation is not of the divine nature considered in itself. Rather, the focus includes what are sometimes designated 'virtually transitive' operations or effects, particularly providence for all things.

As revealed in *Summa theologiae* 1.22.1 and ad 3, providence is the exemplar of things in the Divine Intellect. It includes their end and presupposes the willing of this end as inscribed in their being. Since God is His *intelligere* and *velle*, He is Providence. However, as formally conceived, the exemplar or *ratio* of order in things is designated providence. The execution of this order through the mediation of creatures whose nature is not their being, and consequently, whose action implies a prior and posterior, is termed governance. These precisions about God's effects in terms of providence for all things justify nominal definitions mentioned in other contexts.⁴⁸ Nonetheless, in considering these aspects of the divine action some knowledge of divine governance in the order of discovery, *quoad nos*, is presupposed.

VI

Finally, there is order E, which is that of causality, excess, and remotion. Among the texts in which it is found is *De trinitate* 1.2, section 3. Again, the issue being treated is whether the human intellect can arrive at some knowledge of God. The arguments *sic* and *sed contra* reiterate to some extent arguments encountered in other contexts. The response begins by contrasting the knowledge of something through its own form with that derived through the form of something similar, as when 'a cause is known through the similitude of the effect, and a man through the form of his image'. It is observed that a thing's form can be known in two

⁴⁷ *ST* 1.13.8 ad 2.

⁴⁸ 'Theos', derived from 'theaste' meaning 'consider' or 'see' is noted in diverse places: 1 *Sent.* 2.1.5 exp. text. (Mandonnet, 1.77); *De div. nom.* 12, # 948; *SCG* 1.44, # 381. Within other contexts, however, the derivation from 'thein' as meaning 'quod est semper currere' is considered. Accordingly, emphasis is placed upon the notion of 'perpetuity' (cf. *De caelo* 11.1, # 290; *Expositio meteorologicorum* 1.3, # 19). Concerning the appropriateness of the names 'He who is', 'God', and the 'Tetragrammaton', see Armand Maurer, 'St. Thomas on the Sacred Name "Tetragrammaton"', *Mediaeval Studies* 34 (1972) 275-86; and John P. Doyle, 'Ipsum Esse as God-Surrogate: The Point of Convergence of Faith and Reason for St. Thomas Aquinas', *The Modern Schoolman* 50 (1973) 293-96.

manners. There may be knowledge through the form in the thing itself, 'as God knows Himself through His essence and the angels through theirs'. In contrast, knowledge may be derived of the thing through abstraction, 'when the form is more immaterial than the thing', or through an impression upon the understanding, 'when the thing is simpler than the similitude through which it is known'. This remark offers an opportunity to relate Aristotle's teaching about human intellection deriving forms from sense (*De anima* 3.7.431a14) to St. Augustine's insistence that God's essence infinitely exceeds any created form. This is supported by the remark that due to the 'connaturality of our intellect with knowledge through phantasms' we can not know God's essence, even through an intelligible species.

However, there remains knowledge gained through effects. These can be understood in two ways. Some effects are equal to the power of their cause, and because the plenary power of the cause may be known through them, so may its quiddity. On the other hand, some effects fall short of revealing the full power of their cause, and through these one can only know about the cause that it is, or *quod est*.

... Et sic se habet cognitio effectus ut principium ad cognoscendum de causa an est, sicut se habet quidditas ipsius causae, cum per suam formam cognoscitur. Hoc autem modo se habet omnis effectus ad deum. Et ideo non possumus in statu viae pertingere ad cognoscendum de ipso nisi quia est. Et tamen unus cognoscentium quia est alio perfectius cognoscit, quia causa tanto ex effectu perfectius cognoscitur, quanto per effectum magis apprehenditur habitudo causae ad effectum.

Quae quidem habitudo in effectu non pertingente ad aequalitatem suae causae attenditur secundum tria, scilicet secundum progressionem effectus a causa et secundum hoc quod effectus consequitur de similitudine suae causae et secundum hoc quod deficit ab eius perfecta consecutione. Et sic tripliciter mens humana proficit in cognitione dei, quamvis ad cognoscendum quid est non pertingat, sed an est solum. Primo secundum quod perfectius cognoscitur eius efficacia in producendo res. Secundo, prout nobiliorum effectuum causa cognoscitur, qui cum eius similitudinem aliquam gerant, magis eminentiam eius commendant. Tertio in hoc quod magis ac magis cognoscitur elongatus ab omnibus his, quae in effectibus apparent. Unde dicit Dionysius in libro *De divinis nominibus* (7.3) quod cognoscitur ex omnium causa et excessu et ablatione.⁴⁹

This same inversion of the original Dionysian notions, along with a direct reference to the latter's text, is found in *De trinitate* (6.2, section 4). The consideration is whether we should entirely abandon the imagination in divine science. The orchestration of arguments affirming that one must utilise images in divine science includes a notation of the effective presence of images in Scripture.

⁴⁹ In *Boeth. de trin.* 1.2, sections 2 and 3 (pp. 65-66). The *De div. nom.* reference should read 7.4 instead of 7.3.

Aristotle's conclusion that it is impossible to understand without the imagination (*De anima* 1.1, 403a8 and 3.7, 431a16), and Dionysius's affirmation that the divine light can only illumine us from above by operating through 'the covering of many sacred veils' or 'images of sensible things' are noted. Finally, St. Paul's assertion about knowing the invisible things of God is repeated, and a factual observation is made that any injury to organs which permit the imagination to function inevitably hinders the ability of the intellect to think effectively. The *sed contras* are derived from a statement of Dionysius which explicitly pertains to the highest illuminations in mystical knowledge, and from an observation by St. Augustine that the principal source of error in regard to divine things is the imagination. Also, St. Thomas recalls Boethius's remark that a lower power does not extend to what is proper to a higher, but that it does pertain to the intellect to know the divine and spiritual.

The response begins with a consideration of the beginning and end of knowledge in apprehension and judgment. Well-known texts from the *De anima* (3.3, 429a1 and 7, 431b14) are cited regarding sensation and perception. The termination of knowledge in either the senses, imagination, or intellect is described. Instances are given in which properties and accidents disclosed by the senses reveal a thing's nature and necessitate the conformity of intellectual judgment to what is revealed by the senses. These are related to the term of natural knowledge. Then follows consideration of the termination of mathematical knowledge in the imaginative. Finally, St. Thomas considers beings that transcend the senses and imagination, both in being and in understanding.

Sed tamen ex his, quae sensu vel imaginatione apprehenduntur, in horum cognitionem devenimus vel per viam causalitatis, sicut ex effectu causa perpenditur, quae non est effectui commensurata, sed excellens, vel per excessum vel per remotionem, quando omnia, quae sensus vel imaginatio apprehendit, a rebus huiusmodi separamus; quos modos cognoscendi divina ex sensibilibus ponit Dionysius in libro *De divinis nominibus*.⁵⁰

An identical reordering is found in two texts in the *Summa theologiae*. However, since neither explicates why the order of causality, excellence, and remotion is elected in the context, both passages may be given without any immediate comment. Justification for this order will be evident from final comments on order E.

In the first text, the issue is whether the name 'God' is used in the same sense when said of God, of what participates in Him, and what is opined to do so. The argument which must be countered is the following:

⁵⁰ In *Boeth. de trin.* 6.2, sect. 4 (pp. 216-17).

Nullus potest significare id quod non cognoscit: sed gentilis non cognoscit naturam divinam: ergo, cum dicit 'idolum est Deus', non significat veram deitatem. Hanc autem significat catholicus dicens unum esse Deum. Ergo hoc nomen 'Deus' non dicitur univoce, sed aequivoce, de Deo vero, et de Deo secundum opinionem.

St. Thomas's response is as follows:

... ipsam naturam Dei prout in se est, neque catholicus neque paganus cognoscit: sed uterque cognoscit eam secundum aliquam rationem causalitatis vel excellentiae vel remotionis.... Et secundum hoc, in eadem significatione accipere potest gentilis hoc nomen 'Deus', cum dicit 'idolum est Deus', in qua accipit ipsum catholicus dicens 'idolum non est Deus'. Si vero aliquis esset qui secundum nullam rationem Deum cognosceret, nec ipsum nominaret, nisi forte sicut proferimus nomina quorum significationem ignoramus.⁵¹

The second relevant passage in the *Summa theologiae* presenting this order considers whether the intellect can actually understand the incorporeal by using the species it possesses, without turning to sense images. The argument to be countered is the following:

... incorporalium non sunt aliqua phantasmata: quia imaginatio tempus et continuum non transcendit. Si ergo intellectus noster non posset aliquid intelligere in actu nisi converteretur ad phantasmata, sequeretur quod non posset intelligere incorporeum aliquid. Quod patet esse falsum: intelligimus enim veritatem ipsam, et Deum et angelos.

The following response emphasises the need for comparisons with the corporeal so that we can understand:

... incorporea, quorum non sunt phantasmata, cognoscuntur a nobis per comparisonem ad corpora sensibilia, quorum sunt phantasmata. Sicut veritatem intelligimus ex consideratione rei circa quam veritatem speculamur; Deum autem, ut Dionysius dicit, cognoscimus ut causam, et per excessum, et per remotionem; alias etiam incorporeas substantias in statu praesentis vitae cognoscere non possumus nisi per remotionem, vel aliquam comparisonem ad corporalia. Et ideo cum de huiusmodi aliquid intelligimus, necesse habemus converti ad phantasmata corporum, licet ipsorum non sint phantasmata.⁵²

Finally, there is an important explanatory text regarding this order offered in the *Lectura super Epistolam ad romanos*, which is the following:

⁵¹ ST 1.13.10 ad 5.

⁵² ST 1.84.7 ad 3. Interestingly, it is this ordering of the Dionysian notions which is applied to angelic knowledge of God. 'Cognoscit tamen substantia separata per suam substantiam de Deo quia est; et quod est omnium causa; et eminentem omnibus; et remotum ab omnibus, non solum quae sunt, sed etiam quae mente creata concipi possunt. Ad quam etiam cognitionem de Deo nos utcumque pertingere possumus: per effectus enim de Deo cognoscimus quia est et quod causa aliorum est, aliis supereminens, et ab omnibus remotus' (SCG 3.49, # 2270).

Sciendum est ergo quod aliquid circa Deum est omnino ignotum homini in hac vita, scilicet quid est Deus. ... Et hoc ideo quia cognitio hominis incipit ab his quae sunt ei connaturalia, scilicet a sensibilibus creaturis, quae non sunt proportionate ad representandam divinam essentiam.

Potest tamen homo, ex huiusmodi creaturis, Deum tripliciter cognoscere, ut Dionysius dicit in libro *De divinis nominibus* (7.4).

Uno quidem modo per causalitatem. Quia enim huiusmodi creaturae sunt defectibiles et mutabiles, necesse est eas reducere ad aliquod principium immobile et perfectum. Et secundum hoc cognoscitur de Deo an est.

Secundo per viam excellentiae. Non enim reducuntur omnia in primum principium, sicut in propriam causam et univocam, prout homo hominem generat, sed sicut in causam communem et excedentem. Et ex hoc cognoscitur quod est super omnia.

Tertio per viam negationis. Quia si est causa excedens, nihil eorum quae sunt in creaturis potest ei competere, sicut etiam neque corpus caeleste proprie dicitur grave vel leve aut calidum aut frigidum. Et secundum hoc dicimus Deum immobilem et infinitum et si quid aliud huiusmodi dicitur.

Huiusmodi autem cognitionem habuerunt per lumen rationis inditum.⁵³

This final text explicates what lies behind St. Thomas's reordering of the Dionysian notions in terms of causality, excellence, and negation. It is this fifth order which accords with the foundational inquiry concerning the divine being. Beginning with effects one reasons to the existence of Subsistent Being as First Cause through an argument which manifests the dependency of all things in the order of being upon this Cause.

This is evidenced in the prologue to *Summa theologiae* 1.2. As indicated, the order of development will treat: 1) of God; 2) of the rational creature's advance towards God; 3) of Christ as way to God. Regarding God, the inquiry is divided in terms of: 1) the Divine Essence; 2) the distinction of Persons; 3) the procession of creatures. Finally, in regard to investigation of the Divine Essence, the order of inquiry is determined to be: 1) whether God exists, or 'an est'; 2) the manner of His existence, or rather 'quomodo non sit'; and 3) His operations, namely knowledge, will, and power, 'de his quae ad operationem ipsius pertinent, scilicet de scientia et de voluntate et potentia'.

The priority granted to the question *an est* implies a priority in the order of inquiry of a demonstration *quia*. One moves from a consideration of the necessities manifested in the effect, being as common to all existents discernible in experience, and relentlessly deduces the implications of this feature of experience. Such a

⁵³ In *1 Ad romanos* 6, # 115. This parallels the affirmation that '... Deus in hac vita ... cognoscitur a nobis ex creaturis secundum habitudinem principii, et per modum excellentiae et remotionis' (*ST* 1.13.1). Immediately prior to this, it had been remarked that 'scientia determinat intellectum ad unum per visionem et intellectum primorum principiorum' (*ST* 1.12.13 ad 3).

procedure should lead a metaphysician to a deepened appreciation of the act of being as preeminently inclusive of all other aspects of reality. Accordingly, he is in a position to know the kind of ultimate cause he is searching for.⁵⁴

Viewed comprehensively, the procedure is 'per effectum' and 'quia'. It yields a true demonstration of the existence of that Being which is 'primum movens, quod a nullo movetur'; or 'causam efficientem primam'; or 'quod sit per se necessarium, non habens causam necessitatis aliunde, sed quod est causa necessitatis alii'; or 'aliquid quod omnibus entibus est causa esse et bonitatis, et cuiuslibet perfectionis'; or finally, as 'aliquid intelligens, a quo omnes res naturales ordinantur ad finem'. The development makes no pretense about having met the Aristotelian requirements for completely demonstrative *propter quid* science. However, in its order of inquiry it is true and compelling.

Once executed, one knows 'simpliciter Deus esse', abstracting from knowledge one might receive through assent to revealed doctrine. No longer does one rely merely on knowledge that God exists, possessed in a general and confused way, which 'est nobis naturaliter insertum, inquantum scilicet Deus est hominis beatitudo'.⁵⁵ Rather, in the order of inquiry and demonstration presented we can consider analytically the 'quomodo' of the divine essence, although we can not know 'quid sit'. We cannot 'considerare de Deo quomodo sit, sed potius quomodo non sit'. As St. Thomas insisted, the *via negationis* is predominant here. However, such presupposes a prior affirmation of the existence of the supereminent First Cause.

VII

Aquinas's reorderings of the Dionysian notions imply several things. Each time a distinct order is given, it is conditioned by the focus of the work in which it appears, and by the mode of investigation and exposition defined in each context. However, the utilisation of these diverse orderings reflects a consistent manner of application from the beginning to the end of Aquinas's career. It should also be remarked that the orders accord with St. Thomas's precise canons of inquiry and demonstration.

In effect, the Dionysian *viae* are being ordered internally in terms of the Aristotelian *modi demonstrandi*.⁵⁶ However, this is executed with remarkable

⁵⁴ 'Et ideo quanto aliqua nomina sunt minus determinata et magis communia et absoluta, tanto magis proprie dicuntur de Deo a nobis.... Quolibet enim alio nomine determinatur aliquis modus substantiae rei; sed hoc nomen Qui est nullum modum essendi determinat, sed se habet indeterminate ad omnes; et ideo nominat ipsum pelagus substantiae infinitum' (*ST* 1.13.11c). 'Inter quas [perfectiones] prima est ipsum esse, a qua sumitur hoc nomen Qui est' (*ST* 1.13.11 ad 3).

⁵⁵ *ST* 1.2.2 ad 1 et 3. Also, see *SCG* 3.49, ## 2270 and 2273.

⁵⁶ In 2 *Metaphysicorum* lect. 5, # 337. For instances in which St. Thomas's usage of 'modus' approximates the contemporary notion of 'method', consult James A. Weisheipl, 'The Evolution of

discretion. The Dionysian notions remain intact on the surface since they are derived from a revered authority. Nonetheless, they are bonded to a distinct methodology in a way which permits them to serve in a subsidiary manner as a recessive characteristic in the demonstrative procedure.

The fifth order encapsulates the entire movement of inquiry regarding the divine being. Starting from induction founded on experience and moving through demonstrative reasoning *quia* and what is prior *quoad nos*, one arrives at what is prior *in se* yet posterior *quoad nos*. In establishing the existence of the Eminent Being one is constrained to articulate a negation of the *modi significandi* of conceived perfections which are participated in by the effects of this cause. Through proper intellectual therapy, these perfections may be predicated to yield a judgmental understanding of the supereminent qualities of the First Cause's nature or operations.⁵⁷

In terms of the fifth order there is established a relation of priority and posteriority among the remaining orderings. Order A concerns a mode of knowing which transcends natural inquiry. Order B appears in contexts in which knowledge of God's nature is considered, although such is established in procedures which constitute incomplete demonstrations. It presupposes the existence of God, which order E does not. Orders C and D are posterior to E as well. Order C occurs in relation to demonstration of the nature of immaterial substances or the divine being. Regarding the latter, it is necessary to consider divine immanent activities,

Scientific Method' in *Nature and Motion in the Middle Ages*, ed. William E. Carroll (Washington, 1985), pp. 239-60, especially pp. 240-46. Aquinas's bonding of the Dionysian *triplex via* with Aristotelian methodology necessitates a refinement of the affirmation that: 'The ontology of Thomas is neither pure radical Aristotelianism, nor pure Cryptoprocleanism: it is a combination of both.... Thomas's ontology should be regarded as primarily Cryptoproclean, and its openness to Aristotelian thought not a concession, still less a contradiction, but a development of Aristotelian virtualities, existing particularly in Pseudo-Dionysius's ontology. Thomas's Aristotelian ontology is a prolongation and development of Pseudo-Dionysius's Aristotelianisation of Proclus's ontology...' (Edward Booth, *Aristotelian Aporetic Ontology in Islamic and Christian Thinkers* [Cambridge, 1983], pp. 215 and 218).

⁵⁷ This applies whether names of perfections are negative in their formal meaning (*res significata*), such as eternal or infinite, or whether they imply proportionality, such as goodness, wisdom, and so forth. 'Modus autem supereminentiae quo in Deo dictae perfectiones inveniuntur, per nomina a nobis imposita significari non potest nisi vel per negationem, sicut cum dicimus Deum *aeternum* vel *infinitum*; vel etiam per relationem ipsius ad alia, ut cum dicitur *prima causa*, vel *summum bonum*' (SCG 1.30, # 278). Since the abstracted material quiddity is the proper object of our intellect, there is a difference between the form and that having the form. We may signify the form as such or the composite, resulting in abstract and concrete modes of signification. The abstract does not signify the thing as subsisting as composite: e.g., humanity vs. man, *per modum partis* vs. *per partem totius* (SCG # 277). While abstract terms attain simplicity, they lack a connotation of subsistence since life, goodness, and existence, for example, are not subsistent things. In contrast, concrete terms signify something subsisting while implying composition, such as one finds with being, wise, living, and such (ST 1.13.1 ad 2).

which implies reasoning *propter quid* based upon a defined understanding of the proper and intrinsic appropriateness of intellect and will in the divine being. Order D is presented where there is a focus upon divine, virtually transitive, activities. The governed order inscribed into beings manifests their eminent, extrinsic cause. God is both agent or cause and reason *a quo*, and end or cause and ultimate *propter quid* of their teleology. The reasoning again is *propter quid* mediated by a definition of divine acts. Such confirms the appropriateness of the name 'God' in terms of the eminent causality of the divine being from which all limitation discerned in creatures has been removed.⁵⁸

Throughout these applications pulsates Aquinas's doctrine of analogy, controverted though that doctrine may be.⁵⁹ Nonetheless, it is a fact that the 'esse rerum'

⁵⁸ Interrelations of priority and posteriority between these orderings of the Dionysian notions support the argument that for Aquinas no real distinction between a thing and its being is fully demonstrable before the existence of God has been demonstrated. Consult Joseph Owens, 'Aquinas' Distinction at *De ente et essentia* 4.119-123', *Mediaeval Studies* 48 (1986) 264-87 and *Aquinas on Being and Thing* (Buffalo, 1981).

The issue is not whether one may come to an 'eventual recognition of the essence-esse distinction within every [finite] being' by following the philosophical order of discovery. The question, rather, is whether one may attain demonstrative certitude 'quia' and 'propter quid' regarding the essence-esse distinction by beginning with an intrinsic and extrinsic causal analysis of finite creatures and reason to 'knowledge of God as their cause' after first discerning 'participation in *esse commune*' to attain 'eventual recognition of the essence-esse distinction' (John F. Wippel, 'Thomas Aquinas and Participation' in *Studies in Medieval Philosophy*, ed. John F. Wippel [Washington, 1987], pp. 117-58, especially p. 157). Since the issue concerns conformity to the canons of strict demonstration, it is incorrect to charge that an insistence upon establishing God's existence prior to demonstrating the essence-esse distinction within beings of experience implies 'the theological order rather than the philosophical' (John F. Wippel, *Metaphysical Themes in Thomas Aquinas* [Washington, 1984], p. 124). In a parallel consideration, the 'non-subsistence' of *esse* is insisted upon on the grounds that if 'se conoce meramente como lógico ... sería imposible deducir su dependencia metafísica' (Frederick D. Wilhelmsen, 'Las presuposiciones de la demostración de la existencia de Dios en *De ente et essentia*, c. 4', *Revista de filosofía* [Mexico] 20 [1987] 212-29, especially p. 224, note 18). However, it is because being as a nature has been previously demonstrated to exist that one may 'deduce' the 'dependencia metafísica' of *esse*. This necessarily implies that developments offered here by Wilhelmsen only attain a 'factual conceptual distinction'. Also, see note 3 above. For this terminology as applied to the development by Wippel, see Owens, 'Aquinas' Distinction', especially p. 281.

⁵⁹ The issues raised by the most recent full examination of Aquinas's doctrine regarding analogy may be abstracted from here. See Bernard Montagnes, *La doctrine de l'analogie de l'être d'après saint Thomas d'Aquin* (Louvain, 1963), especially pp. 65-114, regarding a supposed evolution in Aquinas's doctrine. For the criticism that Montagnes does not sufficiently take into account the diverse focusses of Aquinas in different works when he emphasises distinct sorts of analogy, see Marie-Dominique Philippe, 'La doctrine de l'analogie de l'être d'après saint Thomas d'Aquin', *Freiburger Zeitschrift für Philosophie und Theologie* 10 (1963) 445-55.

If one focusses purely on the logic of the demonstrative procedure, it is possible to conclude that: 'As only what is really "being" can be analogous, all analogy is excluded from the question "an est", which refers to the logical "esse". Analogy only comes in when it is also proved that real "esse" — i.e., real existence — appertains in God' (Lyttkens, *The Analogy Between God and the World*, p. 401). However, while the formal articulation of the doctrine of analogy is subsequent to the

is the proximate foundation for the 'esse verum' in the human intellect. Because beings are similar and different, both knowledge and predication are in terms of similarity and difference. Such conditions any consideration of the relation of creatures to Creator in which the analogy is principally of eminence in which diversity is maximal and similarity minimal. Similarity is illuminated through demonstrations of causality in terms of what is 'priora quoad nos' or 'per effectum', rather than 'per priora simpliciter'.⁶⁰ Diversity or difference is manifested through accompanying negative judgments which refine the procedure internally to yield a reflective consideration of 'perfectiones absolutae'.⁶¹ All necessary precautions and qualifications are made to deny to the order of conceptual understanding any grasp of the divine being as it is in itself.

execution of demonstration, the former is virtually implied within the being which is known and reasoned about. 'By reason of the analogy of being in "be-ing" it is possible to demonstrate the existence of God, not indeed, merely as the prime analogue in analogy of attribution, but as the cause (analogically understood according to an analogy of proper proportionality) of the being of all that exists. For the very notion of cause is itself an analogical notion and any demonstration of the existence of the Cause of being, although it may virtually contain an analogy of attribution, derives its probative force from the likeness of proportions which must exist between beings which are only by participation and Being which is in Its own right' (Gerald B. Phelan, 'St. Thomas and Analogy' in *G. B. Phelan: Selected Papers*, ed. Arthur G. Kirn (Toronto, 1967), pp. 95-121, especially pp. 120-21).

⁶⁰ *ST* 1.2.1. Consult Aristotle, *APo.*, I.13, 78a22-79a16 regarding *hoti* and *dioti* demonstrations. Regarding things 'better known in nature' and things 'better known to us', see *Phys.*, I.1, 184a10 ff; *APr.*, II.23, 68b35 ff.; *APo.*, I.2, 71b9-12. Concerning the shift to a priority of demonstration 'propter quid' when establishing divine operations, it should be remarked that such begins with a consideration of those 'quae manet in operante' and which are established after demonstrating that God is 'in summo immaterialitatis'. See *ST* 1.14c. The relevancy of John of St. Thomas's observation should not be forgotten: 'Verius tamen videtur demonstrationem propter quid semper includere demonstrationem quia virtualiter et eminenter' (John of St. Thomas, *Ars logica*, 2.25.4, ed. Reiser, vol. 1, 789a47-50).

⁶¹ '... haec nomina *bonus*, *sapiens* et huiusmodi similia, imposita quidem sunt a perfectionibus procedentibus a Deo in creaturas: non tamen sunt imposita ad significandum divinam naturam, sed ad significandum ipsas perfectiones absolute' (*ST* 1.13.9 ad 3). 'Quaedam vero nomina significant ipsas perfectiones absolutae, absque hoc quod aliquis modus participandi claudatur in eorum significatione, ut *ens*, *bonum*, *vivens*, et huiusmodi: et talia proprie dicuntur de Deo' (*ST* 1.3 ad 1). Regarding the doctrine of absolute consideration, see *De ente et essentia* 3 (Roland-Gosselin, p. 24, lines 2-13). Also, Montagnes, *La doctrine*, p. 101, note 65.

It is imprecise to affirm that for Aquinas, 'The notion that there are two sorts of natural theology — affirmative and negative — is radically misleading if it is thought that the affirmations of natural theology are not themselves subject to a kind of remotion (or removal from them of significant content)' (Victor Preller, *Divine Science and the Science of God: A Reformulation of Thomas Aquinas* [Princeton, 1967], p. 175). Rather, there 'arises the peculiar situation that one can know that God is good, in the proper sense of the notion "good", without having even the faintest notion of what goodness in God is, just as one does not know at all what the divine existence is. Similarly one can know that God is truth, that He is intelligence, that He is wise, and so on, all according to the proper notions of these attributes, without having the least notion of what they are on the divine level' (Joseph Owens, 'Analogy as a Thomistic Approach to Being', *Mediaeval Studies* 24 [1962] 303-322, especially p. 315). See also his 'Aquinas — "Darkness of Ignorance" in the Most Refined Notion of God', *Southwestern Journal of Philosophy* 5 (1974) 93-110, especially pp. 100-107.

The internal consistency of Aquinas's treatments of the Dionysian *triplex via* is of interest for several reasons. It reveals in yet another way how St. Thomas dealt with notions derived from a revered authority and attempted to translate them into a more precise language of demonstration. Moreover, his increasing precision in articulating the significance of Dionysius's notions offers further evidence to consider when analysing how Aquinas constructively appropriated neoplatonic sources. Such considerations not only offer instruction in philosophical inquiry. They also imply that it would be a matter of presumption to accuse a thinker such as Aquinas of carelessness when encountering his alterations of vocabulary in diverse contexts.

APPENDIX

Order of the *triplex via* and representative texts in which they appear:

- A. Ablation, excess, causality:
De div. nom., 7.4; Dionysius # 321; St. Thomas # 729 (1265-67).
- B. Causality, remotion, eminence:
In 1 Sent. 3, *divisio primae partis textus* (1252-56)
In 1 Sent. 3.1.3
In 1 Sent. 22.1, obj. 2
SCG 1.30, ## 277-278 (1259-64)
De pot. 7.5 ad 2 (1265-66)
ST 1.8.1 ad 1 (1266-68)
ST 1.12.12.
- C. Negation or remotion, causality, eminence or excellence:
In 1 Sent. 35.1.1
De trin. 6.3, sect. 5 (1252-59)
SCG 1.14, ## 116-119
De malo 16.8 ad 3 (1266-67)
ST 1.88.2 ad 2
Ad Rom. 1.6, # 117 (1269-72).
- D. Eminence, causality, negation:
ST 1.13.8 ad 2.
- E. Causality, excellence or excess, negation:
De trin. 1.2, sect. 3
De trin. 6.2, sect. 4
SCG 3.49, # 2270
ST 1.13.1
ST 1.13.10 ad 5
ST 1.84.7 ad 3
Ad Rom. 1.6, # 115.

THE LITURGY OF THE LIBERATION OF JERUSALEM

Amnon Linder

THE celebration of the 'Liberation of Jerusalem' from Muslim rule on 15 July 1099 originated with the actual event. Immediately after the massacre in the Temple area, with the Muslim garrison still holding out in the citadel, the crusaders made their way to the Holy Sepulchre. Raymond d'Aguilers, who was among them, captured in his account some of the emotions manifested on that occasion:

Quomodo plaudebant exultantes et cantantes canticum novum Domino. Etenim mens eorum Deo victori et triumphanti vota laudum offerebat, que explicare verbis non poterat. Nova dies, novum gaudium, nova et perpetua leticia laboris atque devotionis consummatio, nova verba nova cantica, ab universis exigebat.¹

They celebrated the office of the Resurrection, an obvious choice in that particular church, but it also expressed their idea of the triumphant achievement of their pilgrimage as a 'Resurrection'.² Raymond's account reflects some more facets of this celebration, above all its significance as 'tocius paganitatis exinanicio, christianitatis confirmatio, et fidei nostre renovatio',³ and its concurrence with the commemoration of the Separatio Apostolorum. The crusaders have returned to vindicate their legitimate possession, as 'filii apostolorum' coming back to 'urbem et patriam quam iuravit patribus'.⁴ Raymond underlines the perpetual character of the celebration established on that day: 'Hec inquam dies celebris in omni seculo venturo.... Hec celebrabitur dies....'⁵ According to his account, the celebrations continued for some six or seven days and were terminated on 22 July, the Octave of 15 July, when the first ruler of Jerusalem was chosen by the leaders of the crusade.⁶

¹ *Le 'Liber' de Raymond d'Aguilers*, ed. J. H. Hill and L. Hill (Paris, 1969), p. 151.

² 'In hac die cantavimus officium de resurrectione, quia in hac die ille qui sua virtute a mortuis resurrexit, per gratiam suam nos resuscitavit' (version B, *ibid.*).

³ *ibid.*

⁴ *ibid.* Interestingly enough, he employs the verb *ejectio* in place of the more common *separatio*.

⁵ *ibid.*

⁶ Hill and Hill, *Le 'Liber'*, p. 152. Identical information in Peter Tudebode, 'Historia de hierosolymitano itinere' in *Recueil des historiens des croisades. Historiens occidentaux*, 5 vols. (Paris, 1844-95), 3.110-11.

Fulcher of Chartres rejoined the main body of the crusaders in Jerusalem some months later and could not, therefore, witness the actual taking of the city, but his account of it, though derivative, is not without interest. It was written almost immediately after the event, with the memory of his informants still unaffected by the legends that were to attach to it later, and Fulcher's ecclesiastical position as chaplain to Baldwin I for some fifteen years makes him a particularly authoritative source concerning the establishment of these festivities. His narrative agrees, essentially, with Raymond's account,⁷ and it refers in a similar way to the establishment of the Liberation festivities.⁸ The factual and precise account given by William, Archbishop of Tyre, accords with these two sources: 'Ad maiorem autem tanti facti memoriam ex communi decreto sancitum et communi omnium voto susceptum et approbatum est, ut hic dies apud omnes sollempnis et inter celebres celebrior perpetuo habeatur.'⁹ This consensus is of significance, because all three authors were closely involved with the ecclesiastical hierarchy of Jerusalem, hence also with the liturgy proper to it. Raymond and Fulcher as, respectively, chaplains to Raymond of St. Gilles and Baldwin I, were certainly more than mere observers during the first, formative stage of this liturgy. One can appreciate the accuracy of their combined account in the light of the description of these festivities that John of Würzburg incorporated into his account of the pilgrimage he undertook to the Holy Land about 1165.¹⁰ By then, the festivities had undergone several important changes. While the original octave was characterized by a public liturgy of joy and thanksgiving, two later additions introduced commemorative services, one for the crusaders fallen in the battle for Jerusalem, on 16 July, and the other for Godefrid of Bouillon, who died on the seventeenth of that month. The Dedication of the new fabric of the Holy Sepulchre in 1149 resulted in further

⁷ Fulcher may have used Raymond's work. His triumphant, exclamatory style in this particular context ('o tempus tam desideratum! o tempus inter cetera tempora memorandum! o factum factis omnibus antefendum', etc) bears a close resemblance to Raymond's parallel passage. Both could be taken, however, as independent witnesses of the feelings shared by the crusaders on the morrow of the taking of Jerusalem. See *Fulcheri Carnotensis Historia hierosolymitana (1095-1127)*, ed. H. Hagenmeyer (Heidelberg, 1913), 1.29, p. 304. A similar passage, dependent, this time, on Fulcher of Chartres, is incorporated into the account given in the anonymous 'Gesta Francorum Iherusalem expugnantium' in *Recueil des historiens des croisades. Historiens occidentaux* 3.515-16.

⁸ '...et vere memoriale et iure memorandum, quia quaeque Dominus Deus noster Jesus Christus, in terra homo cum hominibus conversans, egit et docuit, ad memoriam celeberrimam renovata et reducta sunt orthodoxis. et quod idem Dominus per hunc populum suum...expleri voluit, usque in finem saeculi memoriale linguis tribuum universarum personabit et permanebit' (*Historia hierosolymitana*, p. 306).

⁹ *Guillaume de Tyr. Chronique*, ed. R. B. C. Huygens, H. E. Mayer, and G. Röscher (CCCM 63; Turnhout, 1986), 8.24, p. 417.

¹⁰ John of Würzburg, 'Descriptio Terrae Sanctae', ed. T. Tobler, *Descriptiones Terrae Sanctae* (Leipzig, 1874) pp. 153-54, 190-91. A different version is given in Krinner's edition (c. 9, c. 12) in B. Pezsius, *Anecdotorum thesaurus novissimus* (Augsburg, 1721), 1.3, cols. 483-534 (PL 155.1081-82, 1088-89).

changes, for the Anniversary celebrations of that Dedication were combined with the Liberation service on 15 July. The basic structure of an octave anchored on 15 July, however, as well as its predominant idea of *Liberatio Hierusalem*, still governed the festivities some two generations after their original establishment. Several types of liturgical sources, mainly calendars and, to a lesser extent, breviaries and sacramentaries, testify to the considerable expansion of the Liberation commemoration outside the Holy Land, an expansion that was not limited to churches and monasteries dependent on ecclesiastical mother establishments in Jerusalem.

Charles Kohler identified the Liberation office in the Holy Sepulchre breviary of the Basilica del Santo Sepolcro in Barletta (B), which he published in 1900-1901.¹¹ Its usefulness, as the only text available in print, needs no demonstration, but its shortcomings are nonetheless obvious. The circumstances of its examination and transcription by Kohler were such that the version he published is in many places deficient or purely conjectural. Furthermore, B reflects the Liberation festivities in their post-1149 form; and although it retains important information concerning their earlier form, its later date should be taken into consideration in any evaluation of its contribution to our knowledge of the initial stages of the festivities. While more manuscript evidence is necessary for a better knowledge of the post-1149 Liberation service, the reconstruction of its pre-1149 state depends on the availability of entirely new evidence. Such new evidence is provided by London, British Library Addit. 8927 (hereafter L).

This manuscript is to be dated to the second or third decades of the thirteenth century, at any rate after 16 July 1212, for its last piece, on fol. 135v, refers to the battle of Navas de Tolosa. Its provenance is uncertain. Some faint clues seem to suggest an origin in South France, but no firm proof can be adduced to support this hypothesis. It was bought from the firm of Payne in April 1832, but the acquisition record gives no details of provenance.¹² The bulk of the manuscript is given to the well-known collection of the three historians of the First Crusade — Fulcher of Chartres, Walter the Chancellor, and Raymond d'Aguilers (in this order) — probably in William Grassegals' edition. Unknown to the *Recueils* editors, this manuscript was thoroughly studied by H. Hagenmeyer for his edition of Fulcher of Chartres, and by J. Hugh Hill and L. Hill for their edition of Raymond d'Aguilers.¹³

¹¹ C. Kohler, 'Un Rituel et un Bréviaire du Saint-Sépulcre de Jérusalem (XII^e-XIII^e siècle)', *Revue de l'Orient latin* 8 (1900/1901) 389-430. Kohler's text will be cited, henceforth, as B; that of Vatican, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Barb. lat. 659, which represents a better version, as V. For more details on V consult M. L. Bulst-Thiele, *Sacrae domus militiae templi hierosolymitani magistri. Untersuchungen zur Geschichte des Templerordens 1118/19-1314* (Göttingen, 1974) p. 12.

¹² London, British Library Addit. 62042 (on the aforementioned date).

¹³ Hill and Hill, *Le 'Liber'*, and Hagenmeyer, *Historia*.

Almost no attention was given, however, to the piece which follows Raymond d'Aguilers' text, on folios 134r-135r, under the title *IN FESTIVITATE SANCTE HIERUSALEM*.¹⁴ It is written in a neat, careful script, by the same hand that wrote the last piece. Although it consists of four parts, Vespers, Matins, Lauds and Mass, only Vespers, Lauds and Mass are given specific rubrics. Almost all the items are preceded by the conventional abbreviations, designating them as psalms, antiphons, responsories, versicles and so on. The rubrics, abbreviations and many initials (in various sizes, according to their position and function in the text) are written in red or struck through by horizontal red strokes. The first words of several items, such as the Matins Invitatory, the *De syon*, and the sequence *Manu plaudant*, are notated, although without musical supports.

The following edition presents the text transmitted in this manuscript, with identification of the Scriptural and liturgical sources of each item. The liturgical references are mainly to the standard works of René Jean Hesbert — *Antiphonale missarum sextuplex* (Brussels, 1935), hereafter cited as *Sext.*, and *Corpus antiphonarium officii* (Rome, 1963-65), hereafter cited as *Corpus* — and to S. J. P. Van Dijk, *Sources of the Modern Roman Liturgy: The Ordinals by Haymo of Faversham and Related Documents (1243-1307)*, 2 vols. (*Studia et documenta franciscana* 1-2; Leiden, 1963), hereafter cited as *Van Dijk*. References to Hesbert are given in his numeration, references to Van Dijk in page numbers. Specific antiphonal variations are designated by their sigla in Hesbert's works. The manuscript's capitalization and spelling have been rendered unchanged. Editorial additions are made in square brackets, emendations are noted in footnotes, and noted text is placed between asterisks.

IN FESTIVITATE SANCTE HIERUSALEM (LONDON BL ADDIT. 8927 fols. 134r-135r)

AD VESPERAS

1. A. Ecce nomen Domini
Is 30:27-28.
2. P. Letatus sum
Ps 121:1. Gradual.
Sext. nos. 60, 193, 194a.

¹⁴ The most recent reference known to us was given in a casual remark by J. France, in his article 'An Unknown Account of the Capture of Jerusalem', *English Historical Review* 87 (1972) 783. The information it provides on this office is mostly erroneous. The only piece published from the text of this office is the sequence 'Manu plaudant omnes gentes', identified and published by H. M. Bannister, *Analecta hymnica medii aevi* 40 (Leipzig, 1902), no. 60, pp. 71-72.

- 4th Sunday in Quadr. MRBCKS
18th Sunday after Pent. RBKS
19th Sunday after Pent. MB
3. A. Leva ierusalem
Is 60:4.
Corpus no. 3606; Various dates in I-II Adv.
4. P. Qui confidunt
Ps 124:1.
Sext. no. 60. Tract, 4th Sunday in Quadr.
Stat. ad Hieros. MRBCKS
5. A. Levabit dominus signum
Is 11:12.
Corpus no. 3607. Var. dates in II Adv.
6. P. In convertendo
Ps 125:1.
7. A. Elevare elevare
Is 52:1-2.
Corpus no. 2633. Var. dates in III-IV Adv.
Vig. Nat.
8. P. Super flumina
Ps 136:1.
9. A. Letamini cum ierusalem
Is 66:10.
Corpus no. 3562. Various dates II-III Adv.
" " Nat.
10. P. Lauda ierusalem
Ps 147:1. Anniv. ded. eccl., Vesp. (*Van Dijk*, p. 184)
11. Cap. Surge illuminare
Is 60:1. Epiphany (*Van Dijk*, pp. 42, 43, 46).
12. R. Benedictus
Ps 71:18,19.
- 12a. V. Replebitur
Ps 71:19
Corpus no. 6249. Trinity.
13. Ymnus Urbs beata ierusalem
RH no. 20918; *AH* LI, 110 Ded. eccl.
14. <A>. Omnes de Saba venient
Is 60:6.
Corpus no. 4119 or no. 4120. Epiphany.
15. A. Venite ascendamus

Is 2:3.

Corpus no. 5349.

In III Adv.

16. **Canticum Magnificat**

17. **Oratio** Deus qui nobis per singulos annos sanctae civitatis tuae ierusalem acceptionis reparas diem et sacris semper mysteriis representas incolumes; exaudi preces populi tui; et presta ut quisquis eam civitatem petiturus ingreditur; cuncta se impetrasse letetur. per.

See: Commune ded. eccl. (Bruylants, Or. no. 392).

<Ad Matutinum>

18. **Invitatorium** *Filiae sion currite* adsunt enim celebria matris *vestre* sollempnia iubilemus igitur deo nostro unanimes qui sibi eam gratuitam elegit ecclesiam.

Corpus no. 1079

Ded. eccl.

S: + Ps Venite exultemus

19. **P. Venite**

Ps 94. [=Venite exultemus]

20. **A. Ierusalem respice**

Is 33:20

Corpus no. 3481.

In I Adv.

21. **P. Domine dominus noster**

Ps 8:1.

Var. dates in Epiphany (*Van Dijk*, pp. 46, 49)

22. **A. *De syon exhibit lex***

Is 2:3.

Corpus no. 2119.

Var. dates in I-II Adv.

23. **P. Celi enarrant**

Ps 18:1.

Var. dates in Advent, Nativity, Epiphany.

24. **A. Syon noli timere**

Is 35:4.

Corpus no. 4969.

Var. dates in I Adv.

25. **P. Domini est terra**

Ps 23:1.

Var. dates in Nativity, Epiphany, Anniv. ded. eccl. (*Van Dijk*, pp. 39, 46, 50, 184).

26. **V. Super te iherusalem**

Is 60:2.

Versicle; *Corpus* no. 8210.

Vig. Nat.

27. **LECTIONES DE HISTORIA UBI CAPTA FUIT HIERUSALEM.**

INCIPIUNTUR ENIM SIC. Est enim civitas ierusalem in montano loco sita. Fulcherius Carnotensis, *Historia Hierosolymitana*, 1.26, ed. H. Hagenmeyer (Heidelberg, 1913) p. 281.

28. **R.** Illuminare illuminare
Is 60:1.
- 28a. **V.** Et ambulabunt gentes
Is 60:3.
Corpus no. 6882. Epiphany
29. **R.** Ierusalem cito veniet salus
Mich 4:8-9.
- 29a. **V.** Israel si me audieris
Ps 80:9-11.
Corpus no. 7031. 2nd Sunday in Adv.
30. **R.** Hec est ierusalem civitas magna
Apoc 21:2,3.
- 30a. **V.** Porte eius non claudentur
Apoc 21:25. GDFL
Corpus no. 6803.
31. **A.** Fluminis impetus
Ps 45:5.
Corpus no. 2886. Var. dates in Epiphany.
32. **P.** Deus noster¹⁵
Ps 45:1
Epiphany Matins (after A.
Fluminis impetus, *Van Dijk*)
33. **A.** Super te ierusalem
Is 60:2.
Corpus no. 5065. Var. dates in I-II Adv.
34. **P.** Magnus dominus
Ps 47:1. Var. dates in Nat., Pent., Anniv. ded.
eccl. (*Van Dijk*, pp. 32, 101, 184).
35. **A.** Dabo in syon
Is 46:13.
Corpus no. 2094. 3rd Sunday in Adv.
36. **P.** Te decet ymnus
Ps 64:2.
37. **V.** Tu exurgens domine misereberis
Ps 101:14.
Versicle (*Van Dijk*, p. 237)¹⁶
38. **R.** Civitas ierusalem

¹⁵ A. Deus nostrum MS.

¹⁶ See also L. Brou and J. Vives, *Antifonario visigotico mozarabe de la Catedral de Leon* (Barcelona, 1959), pp. 340, 342, 482.

- 38a. V. Ecce in fortitu<dine> **GDFS**
Is 40:10
Corpus no. 6290. 2nd Sunday in Adv.
39. R. Ierusalem plantabis
Jer 31:5,7.
- 39a. V. Exulta satis **DFS**
Zach 9:9. 2nd Sunday in Adv.
Corpus no. 7033.
40. R. Lapidēs preciosi
Tob 13:21.
- 40a. V. Cumque a iohanne **R**
Corpus no. 7074. Ded. eccl.
41. A. Syon renovaberis
Is 62:2.
Corpus no. 4970. Var. dates in I-II Adv.
42. P. Quam dilecta
Ps 83:2. Anniv. ded. eccl. (*Van Dijk*, pp. 184, 317).
43. A. Ierusalem gaude
Zach 9:9.
Corpus no. 3478. 3rd Sunday in Adv.
44. P. Fundamenta
Ps 86:1. Var. dates in Nativity, Epiphany, Anniv.
ded. eccl. (*Van Dijk*, pp. 39, 44, 184).
45. A. Ierusalem civitas sancta ornamentis martyrum decorata cuius platee sonant
laudes de die in diem alleluia.
Corpus no. 3477. In Letania
D adds alleluia.
46. P. Cantate domino
Ps 149:1. Var. dates in Nativity, Epiphany, Anniv.
ded. eccl. (*Van Dijk*, pp. 32, 39, 42, 184).
47. V. Reges tharsis et insule munera offerent
Ps 71:10.
Versicle, *Corpus* no. 8180. Epiphany
48. R. Super muros tuos
Is 62:6.
- 48a. V. Predicabunt
Is 66:19. **F²SL**
Corpus no. 7723.
49. R. Sicut mater
Is 66:13-14.

- 49a. V. Dabo in syon
Is 46:13. **GDFS**
Corpus no. 7660. 2nd Sunday in Adv.
50. R. Plateae tue ierusalem
Tob 13:22,13.
- 50a. V. Luce splendida **F²SL**
Corpus no. 7390.
- In Laudibus**
51. A. Iocundare filia syon
Zach 9:9.
Corpus no. 3509. 1st Sunday in Adv.
52. A. Urbs fortitudinis
Is 26:1-2.
Corpus no. 5281. 2nd Sunday in Adv.
53. A. Ierusalem gaude
Zach 9:9.
Corpus no. 3478. 3rd Sunday in Adv.
54. A. Omnes nationes venient a longe portantes munera sua alleluia
Corpus no. 4128. Var. dates in Epiphany
55. VE. Leva Ierusalem
Is 60:4.
Versicle, *Corpus* no. 7085 (?) 2nd Sunday in Adv.
56. **Ymnus** Urbs beata ierusalem
Supra no. 13
57. V. Venit lumen tuum ierusalem
Is 60:1,3.
Versicle, *Corpus* no. 8234. Var. dates in Epiphany
58. In **evangelium** A. Cum appropinquaret
Mt 21:1.
59. **Canticum**. Benedictus
Canticum Zachariae, Lc 1:68-79.
60. V. Venit lumen tuum
See no. 57.
- Ad missam**
61. **Introitus**¹⁷ Letare ierusalem
Is 66:10-11.
Sext no. 60. 4th Sunday in Quadrag.
Statio ad Ierusalem + no. 62.

¹⁷ Offertorium MS.

62. **P.** Letatus sum
Ps 121:1. 4th Sunday in Quadrag. (See above),
18th and 19th Sunday after Pent.
63. **Oratio** Deus qui nobis annos. ut supra.
See no. 17.
64. **Epistula.** Surge illuminare
Is 60:1. Epiphany (*finis et laudem domini annuntiantes*; nos. 65, 65a; *Van Dijk*, pp. 216-17)
65. **R.** Omnes de Saba venient
Is 60:1.
- 65a. **V.** Surge
Is 60:1.
Responsory-Gradual. *Sext.* no. 18. Epiphany (See no. 64)
66. **Alleluia V.** Te decet ymnus
Ps 64:2.
Alleluia versicle, *Corpus* no. 8440. *Sext.* no. 78.
Easter; 5th Sunday after Pent.
67. **vel** Qui confidunt
Ps 124:1.
Alleluia versicle, *Corpus* no. 8437. Easter
68. **Prosa** *Manu plaudant omnes gentes ad nova miracula
Vicit lupos truculentos agnus sine macula
Paganorum* nunc est facta humilis superbia
Quam reflexit virtus dei ad nostra servicia.
O nova milicia.
Paucis multa milia sunt devicta.
Venit hec victoria a xristi potencia benedicta.
Ecce signum est levatum ab antiqua presignatum
profecia¹⁸
Quisque portat signum crucis dum requirit summi ducis
loca pia
Redde sancta civitas laudes deo debitas.
Ecce tui filii et filie de longinquo veniunt cotidie¹⁹
Ad te porta gloriae pro culparum veniam
Ecce honor debitus est sepulcro redditus.
Quod profecia presciens sic loquitur et sepulcrum eius
honorabitur²⁰

¹⁸ See Is 11:12.¹⁹ See Is 60:4.²⁰ See Is 11:10. The same reference is found in Robert the Monk, 'Historia hierosolimitana' 9.9 in *Recueil des historiens des croisades. Historiens occidentaux* 3.869.

eiusdem redemptoris nostri sepulcrum. a viciorum sepulcris resuscitari mereamur. et felicitatis eterne gaudia consequemur; per eundem.

* * *

Analysis of the service's structure brings out its four constituent parts,²³ vigil Vespers on 14 July, Matins, Lauds and Mass on 15 July.

The vigil Vespers is of the usual type.²⁴ It has five psalms preceded by five antiphons, a Chapter followed by a responsory, a hymn, the Magnificat with its antiphon and a Collect.

The Matins office²⁵ is of the secular type;²⁶ opening with an Invitatory, it has nine antiphons, psalms and responsories, arranged in three nocturns. Although the number of lessons read during this office is not specified, and our manuscript refers to *Lectiones* only once, in the first nocturn, the overall arrangement in three nocturns and the nine responsories imply nine lessons as well.

The Lauds structure, like that of the preceding Vespers, is, on the whole, quite normal.²⁷ It has only four antiphons, indicating four psalms²⁸; and the Benedictus is preceded by its own antiphon, with a hymn and three versicles. It does not have a Collect or a Chapter.

The Mass has its proper Introit, five prayers (a Collect identical to that of the vigil Vespers, Offertory, Secret, Communio, Postcommunio), a Benediction super populum, a *prosa* and several other items.²⁹

This source reflects, consequently, the service on the first day of the celebrations, from the vigil Vespers office on the evening of 14 July, through the office of Matins and Lauds, to the Mass proper for 15 July. The office of Matins is of particular interest, for it indicates that the liturgical model adopted by our liturgist was the secular, rather than the monastic, feast type. This choice was practically determined

²³ We have used the abbreviations established by A. Hughes, *Medieval Manuscripts for Mass and Office. A Guide to Their Organization and Terminology* (Toronto, 1982).

²⁴ **Vespers:** 1-2. A+P; 3-4. A+P; 5-6. A+P; 7-8. A+P; 9-10. A+P; 11. C; 12. R; 13. H; 14. A (or D?); 15. M; 16. M; 17. O;

²⁵ **Matins:** 18-19. I; 20-21. A+P; 22-23. A+P; 24-25. A+P; 26. D; 27. L; 28. R; 29. R; 30. R; 31-32. A+P; 33-34. A+P; 35-36. A+P; 37. D; 38. R; 39. R; 40. R; 41-42. A+P; 43-44. A+P; 45-46. A+P; 47 D; 48. R; 49. R; 50. R.

²⁶ See Hughes, *Medieval Manuscripts*, pp. 53-55.

²⁷ **Lauds:** 51. A; 52. A; 53. A; 54. A; 55. D 56. H; 57. D; 58. B; 59. B; 60. D.

²⁸ This number does not include the lesser canticle, which, when counted, brings the number of psalms to five; most feasts have, indeed, a Lauds office of five psalms (Hughes, *Medieval Manuscripts*, p. 67). Comparison with the Lauds office of the post-1149 Liberation festivity (in B and V) indicates, in fact, that while our manuscript agrees with B in having only four psalms, V testifies to five, the fifth being a canticle ('Benedicite — Canticum trium puerorum').

²⁹ **Mass:** 61-62. I; 63. O; 64. L; 65. R; 66. D; vel 67. D; 68. Prosa; 69. L; 70. O; 71. O; 72. C; 73. O; 74. A; 75. O.

by the venue of the festivity, the Patriarchal church of the Holy Sepulchre, which was served by canons regular from the very first days of the establishment of the Latins in Jerusalem.³⁰ In its depiction of a secular type of feast our text is in complete accord with the post-1149 descriptions of the liturgy of the Holy Sepulchre. This similarity, as well as the unmistakable emphasis throughout our text on the presence of pilgrims to Jerusalem among the worshippers,³¹ points to a common source for both documents in the liturgy proper to the Holy Sepulchre.

If our text and the Ordo documented in B and V derive from the same liturgical practice, their comparison should enable us to determine their relative positions in the evolution of that practice. There is no difficulty in dating both B and V to a post-1149 period, for they transmit the office established on the occasion of the 1149 Dedication. Furthermore, the *terminus ante quem* of the breviary preserved in BV should be dated to c. 1170, as its Sanctoral still lacks the feast of St. Thomas Becket (canonized in 1173).³² It testifies, therefore, to the period between 1149 and 1170. Comparison of this text with L brings out enough important identical elements to prove a common affinity, but it also reveals many differences. Affinity in office is demonstrated by identical Invitatories,³³ hymns,³⁴ and Chapters,³⁵ and in the Mass by the same Introit,³⁶ Epistle,³⁷ Gradual,³⁸ Prose,³⁹ Offertory,⁴⁰ and Communio.⁴¹ Their main difference consists in two different antiphonal and psalmodic programs (different in choice and in arrangement), as well as some different prayers and other items. It is obvious that a radical reform of the service resulted in these two divergent versions. As version V of the Holy Sepulchre breviary was in use after 1173,⁴² it is clear that this version is subsequent to L, and

³⁰ Since August 1099. See H. E. Mayer, *Bistümer, Klöster und Stifte im Königreich Jerusalem* (Stuttgart, 1977) pp. 1-2.

³¹ See, in particular, the Secret (no. 71): 'quicumque fideles istam civitatem cuius anniversarium acceptionis diem celebramus ingrediuntur'; also see the specific reference to the Holy Sepulchre in the Benediction super populum (no. 75).

³² The chronological tables which precede the Ordo, and which seem to be contemporaneous with it, were composed before 1167. They give 1139 as the beginning of the solar-cycle rather than 1167, the opening-year of the next cycle. See Bulst-Thiele, *Sacrae domus*, p. 12, note 12.

³³ Vespers: Ecce nomen Domini (no. 1) Matins: Filie Sion currite (no. 18) Lauds: locundare filia Sion (no. 51).

³⁴ Vespers, no. 13. Repeated several times in BV.

³⁵ Vespers, no. 11.

³⁶ Letare Ierusalem (no. 62).

³⁷ Surge illuminare (no. 64).

³⁸ Omnes de Saba (no. 65).

³⁹ Manu plaudant omnes (no. 68).

⁴⁰ Dexter a Domini (no. 70).

⁴¹ Ierusalem surge (no. 72).

⁴² If, as seems to be the case, the prayer to Thomas Becket appended to the Ordo existed already in the source copied by the copyist of V rather than inserted by him into his copy. As B presents a version which is practically identical to V, the dating of its version and its use depends, in this case, on the information supplied by V.

that version BV is the result of changes introduced into L. An important *terminus post quem* for the dating of L is provided by the Matins Lessons, which are taken from Fulcher of Chartres' *Historia hierosolymitana*.⁴³ This work is known in two editions, the first covering events to 1124, and the second to 1127. The Incipit quoted in L does not conform absolutely to either edition,⁴⁴ but the slight difference between the two dates is of no real consequence for our purpose. The *terminus post quem* could have been dated, therefore, to between 1122 and 1127, but for the fact that the first edition had been in the public domain even before it was terminated. There are good grounds to assume that Fulcher's work was read and drawn upon as early as about 1106.⁴⁵ Consequently that date should be adopted as the *terminus post quem*. The *terminus ante quem* is much harder to determine, for it depends to some extent on the problem of the Liberation of Jerusalem Mass documented in the appendix to John of Würzburg's work and in Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale lat. 12056; these two sources seem to represent an intermediate stage between L and BV.⁴⁶ For our present purpose, however, we shall have to rest content with the dating of L to the first half of the twelfth century, roughly between 1106-1127 and 1149.

The Introit to the Liberation Mass, *Laetare Ierusalem*, reflects the tone of the whole service. All its liturgical items, antiphons and psalms, responsories and versicles, prayers, hymns and sequence, are proper to this festivity in the fullest sense of the term, for the entire service was designed to transmit the one central idea of the liberation of Jerusalem. Some of these items are original, but most are Scriptural texts selected for their relevance to the occasion. The liturgist who created this service could have chosen his items directly from their original scriptural sources; he was certainly sufficiently conversant with them. We have assumed, however, that he had adopted a different and easier method, and looked for the relevant items in existing liturgical schemes. This hypothesis will be confirmed if the entire body, or the greater part, of these antiphonal and scriptural texts is shown to have been available to the liturgist in the liturgical sources accessible to him, and, secondly, if his selection was made from a small number of easily identifiable liturgical schemes. The first question poses no real difficulty, for almost all, if not actually all, the antiphonal items are known from other, earlier sources.⁴⁷ The answer to the second question is given in the following table, which

⁴³ No. 27.

⁴⁴ Incipit: Est enim civitas ierusalem in montano loco sita. The first edition has: Est quidem civitas ipsa in montano loco sita. The second edition has: Est equidem civitas Iherusalem in montano loco posita (Hagenmeyer, *Gesta Francorum*, p. 281).

⁴⁵ Fulcher of Chartres, *A History of the Expedition to Jerusalem*, ed. R. Ryan (Knoxville, 1969), pp. 21-22.

⁴⁶ We hope to discuss this problem elsewhere.

⁴⁷ Consult, on this point, the references to Hesbert's *Corpus* and *Sext*. The ordinal numbers of Sundays are given between brackets.

classifies the sixty-eight scriptural and antiphonal items⁴⁸ according to their original liturgical sources:⁴⁹

Advent: nos. 3(I-II), 5(II), 7(III-IV), 9(II-III), 15(III),
20(I), 22(I-II), 23, 24(I), 29(II), 33(I-II), 35(III),
38(II), 39(II), 41(I-II), 43(III), 49(II), 51(I),
52(II), 53(III), 55(II), 72(II).

Total: 22 (Sundays: I=3, II=8 III=4 IV=0)

Epiphany: nos. 11, 14, 21, 23, 25, 28, 31, 32, 44, 46, 47, 54,
57, 64, 65, 70.

Total: 16

Ded. eccl.: nos. 10, 13, 17, 18, 19, 25, 34, 40, 42, 44, 46

Total: 11

Nativity: nos. 7, 9, 23, 25, 26, 34, 44, 46, 69.

Total: 9

4th Sunday in Quadrag.: nos. 2, 4, 61, 62.

Total: 4

Easter: nos. 45, 66, 67, 70.

Total: 4.

Others: About 10.

Four liturgical schemes contributed, consequently, the bulk of the liturgical items: the Advent period (with particular emphasis on its second and third weeks), Epiphany, Dedication of Churches, and Nativity. A smaller, though not unimportant, contribution was made from the liturgies of the fourth Sunday in Quadregesima and Easter.

As none of these commemorations, with the sole exception of the Dedication, could ever correspond to the date of the liberation, 15 July, one has to eliminate the possibility that an actual concurrence resulted in the transfer of liturgical items. The considerations that guided that selection were therefore entirely thematic. The liturgist turned to those liturgical schemes which were seen to transmit a message similar, if not identical, to the one he wanted to embody in the Liberation service. The clear preponderance of the second Sunday and its week in relation to the other Advent dates is due, obviously, to the stational character of that Sunday *ad sanctam*

⁴⁸ The total number of items (75) less 7, the number of the original items (prayers, sequence and lessons).

⁴⁹ The following identifications are not exhaustive, as they do not include all the liturgical uses of each item, only those that were reasonably applicable in the construction of the Liberation Service. We have therefore concentrated on the Temporal at the expense of the Sanctoral. The total number of the items classified in this table is larger than that of the original list owing to the not infrequent multiple employment of one item in several liturgical schemes used in our classification (e.g., Advent as well as Epiphany).

Crucem in Hierusalem.⁵⁰ Identical considerations led to the adoption of the fourth Sunday in Quadragesima, which shares the same *statio*, as a liturgical source. The liturgist's choice was not governed by mere formal criteria, but above all by attention to the content of these services. The vision of Jerusalem as it evolved in the liturgical framework of both Sundays was similar to that of our liturgist, and this was the main reason he turned to them, even to the extent of choosing the Introit of the fourth Sunday in Quadragesima to open the Liberation Mass.

The same attention to content is obvious in the liturgist's treatment of the scheme that supplied him with the third largest group of items, the Dedication service. Contrary to first impressions, no actual, historical dedication resulted in the introduction of Dedication elements into L. The liturgist employs the concept of dedication metaphorically rather than literally, in regard to Jerusalem and not in reference to a particular church. This can be observed in three of L's original prayers, which apply to the city of Jerusalem ideas originally applied in the course of any Dedication service. Their original, limited meaning has thus become enlarged and even transformed. Such a transformation is easy to detect in the Collect, the Secret and the Postcommunio, where *templum* was consistently replaced by *sancta civitas Hierusalem*, and *dies consecrationis* by *dies acceptionis*.⁵¹ If the Liberation of Jerusalem is conceived as an act of Dedication, no actual dedication is necessary in order to explain the choice of this particular liturgical source.

Another characteristic of our liturgist's approach to his sources is the complete freedom he exhibits in his selection. Mechanical transfer, by pattern or in blocks,

⁵⁰ Consult Hesbert's pertinent observations on the nature of this Mass in *Sext.*, p. xxxvii.

⁵¹ Compare the following texts, which served as sources for L's Collect, Secret, and Postcommunio (words replaced are italicized, L's version is given in bold letters in parentheses):

1. Deus, qui nobis per singulos annos *hujus sancti templi tui consecrationis* (**sancte civitatis tue ierusalem acceptionis**) reparas diem, et sacris semper mysteriis repraesentas incolumes: exaudi preces populi tui, et praesta; ut, quisquis *hoc templum* (**eam civitatem**) beneficia petiturus ingreditur, cuncta se impetrasse laetetur. Per Dominum. (P. Bruylants, *Les oraisons du Missel Romain*, 2 vols. [Louvain, 1952], vol. 2, no. 392).

2. Annue, quaesumus, Domine, precibus nostris: ut quicumque *intra templi hujus, cujus anniversarium dedicationis* (**fideles istam civitatem cuius anniversarium acceptionis**) diem celebramus, *ambitum continemur* (**ingrediuntur**), plena tibi, atque perfecta corporis et animae devotione *placeamus* (**placeant**); et (ut), dum haec vota praesentia *reddimus* (**reddunt**), ad aeterna praemia, te adjuvante, pervenire *mereamur* (**mereantur**). Per Dominum. (Bruylants, *Les oraisons*, no. 55).

3. Deus qui ecclesiam tuam sponsam vocare dignatus es, ut quae haberet gratiam per fidei devotionem haberet etiam ex nomine pietatem. Da ut omnis haec plebs nomini tuo serviens, huius vocabuli consortio digna esse mereatur, et *ecclesia tua in templo cuius natalis est hodie* (**que sancte civitatis tue ierusalem acceptionis celebrat diem, tibi**) collecta, te timeat, te diligat, te *sequitur* (**sequatur**), et (ut) dum iugiter per vestigia tua graditur, ad caelestia promissa te ducente pervenire *mereatur* (**mereamur**). Per Dominum. (*Liber sacramentorum Romanae Ecclesiae*, from Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale lat. 2296, fols. 37v-38r; there are certain variations in *Testimonia orationis christianae antiquioris*, eds. P. Salmon, C. Coebergh, and P. de Puniet [CCCM 47; Turnhout, 1977], p.169).

is not unknown in his work, but its extent is very limited. The only case of transfer in pattern is the series consisting of nos. 51, 52 and 53, which corresponds to the series of the second antiphons in Lauds of, respectively, the first, second, and third Sundays in Advent. Cases of the second type are slightly more numerous, yet most of them are pairs of antiphon and psalm, whose traditional association favored their retention together. Examples of this type are nos. 18 and 19, 31 and 32, 61 and 62. Even in these cases, however, one observes the complete accord between the texts and the overall message governing the entire service. Relevance was, undoubtedly, the chief criterion applied by our liturgist.

Particularly important information concerning the liturgist and his sources can be obtained by examining the refrains he selected for the nine responsories of the Matins office. As he had several alternatives to choose from, it is reasonable to assume that his choice reflects his particular background as well as that of the Holy Sepulchre convent. The results of this examination are tabulated according to the classification established by Hesbert, the secular families in the first group to the left, the monastic families in the following group on the right:⁵²

28a.	C G B E M V	H R D F S L
29a.	C B E ⁴ M V	H R D ⁴ F S
30a.	G	D F L
38a.	G	D F S
39a.		D F S
40a.		R
48a.		F ² S L
49a.	G	D F S
50a.		F ² S L

It is obvious that the liturgist turned to monastic sources rather than to secular models, despite the secular character of the Liberation festivities in general and of the Matins office involved in particular. It is equally clear that the hard core of the liturgical sources he employed is represented by three families, DFS; in this group

⁵² The sigla used by Hesbert are as follows:

C - Compiègne Antiphonary (s. ix²).
 G - North France (s. xi).
 B - Bamberg Antiphonary (s. xii ex.).
 E - Ivrea Antiphonary (s.xi).
 M - Monza Antiphonary (s. xi in.).
 V - Verona Antiphonary (s. xi).
 H - St. Gall Antiphonary (s. x ex.).
 R - Rheinau Antiphonary (s. xiii).
 D - St. Denis Antiphonary, North France (s. xii).
 F - Saint-Maur-les-Fossés Antiphonary, Cluny family (s. xii).
 S - Silos Antiphonary (s. xi).
 L - St. Loup, Benevento (s. xii ex.).

of nine refrains F is represented eight times, S seven times and D six times. Combined together they appear five times.⁵³ This strong position is even further highlighted when the first two refrains, 28a and 29a, which are common to practically all the families examined, are omitted from our calculation. The remaining seven choices, which should be considered therefore as particularly typical of our liturgist, derive mainly from DFS, with the strong accord of the secular type G and the monastic type L. Our liturgist, in other words, was particularly influenced either by one of the three families — the Cluniac order, Silos and St. Denis — or by a combination of two or all three of them. At the present stage of our research we would prefer the first alternative, but the other alternatives should not be dismissed too easily. Such a combination seems to reflect not only the particular character of the convent of the Holy Sepulchre, but that of the ecclesiastical hierarchy of Jerusalem in general, during the first half of the twelfth century.⁵⁴

Our enquiry has shown, we believe, that the liturgist who created this service expended great care and attention in its design. It has the hallmark of a well-planned and well-organized service; it could indicate, consequently, the ideas that inspired the liturgist. They could be observed in three ways. The more direct

⁵³ The extent of agreement between the different families is as follows:

	C	G	B	E	M	V	H	R	D	F	S	L
C		1	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	1
G	1		1	1	1	1	1	1	4	4	3	2
B	2	1		2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	1
E	2	1	2		2	2	2	2	2	2	2	1
M	2	1	2	2		2	2	2	2	2	2	1
V	2	1	2	2	2		2	2	2	2	2	1
H	2	1	2	2	2	2		2	2	2	2	1
R	2	1	2	2	2	2	2		2	2	2	1
D	2	4	2	2	2	2	2	2		6	5	2
F	2	4	2	2	2	2	2	2	6		7	4
S	2	3	2	2	2	2	2	2	5	7		3
L	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	4	3	

The number of refrains contributed by each family: C : 2; G : 4; B : 2; E : 2; M : 2; V : 2; H : 2; R : 3; D : 6; F : 8; S : 7; L : 4.

⁵⁴ Heterogeneous origins, similar to those of the Holy Sepulchre convent, were probably to be found in other ecclesiastical establishments as well. The combination of North French, Spanish and Italian elements, so evident in L, reappears among the canons documented in the Holy Sepulchre cartulary. One Peter of Barcelona is mentioned in documents from 1120, 1132, 1135 and 1144, together with canons from Paris, Le Mans and Normandy (G. Bresc-Bautier, *Le cartulaire du chapitre du Saint-Sépulchre de Jerusalem* [Paris 1984], nos. 22, 27, 38, 97, 102). Documents from 1143, 1151, and 1154 (nos. 68, 69, 114, 115) mention canons from Poitou, Spain ('Yspania') and Bologna, and another Peter of Barcelona appears in 1177 (doc. no. 162). While the dominance of the French element in Jerusalem is a matter of common agreement among historians, we are not aware of a comparable attention to the presence of Spanish ecclesiastics, so strongly suggested by our liturgy.

approach passes through the pieces which are original and proper to this service. A still explicit evidence, though one which owes much of its meaning to the liturgist's selection of the texts and their contextual organization, is presented by the psalmodic and antiphonal body of the service. A much more allusive level of significance consists of the meanings accrued to the texts in the liturgical schemes from which they were received. A full-scale analysis of this type should form the subject of a separate study, but a brief description of the main ideas developed in the Liberation service would be quite warranted even in the present state of our knowledge.

It is, first and foremost, an impressive service of victory. The liberation of Jerusalem by the crusaders is commemorated in the lessons chosen from Fulcher of Chartres' description of the city and narrative of the siege. This is, to our knowledge, the first positive evidence of the liturgical use of this historiographical source, and the fact that it took place in Jerusalem itself certainly added to the authority of the text chosen for this purpose.⁵⁵ Furthermore, narratives of the liberation of Jerusalem were commented on and expanded in sermons delivered after Lauds, on the very spot where the crusaders breached the city walls. The festive crowd made its way in solemn procession from the Holy Sepulchre to the Templum Domini, 'et inde divertentes convertimur contra illum locum ubi civitas capta fuit. Facta statione, fit sermo ad populum'.⁵⁶ A sermon written for that occasion was published by Kohler.⁵⁷ It relies so heavily on Fulcher that it was formerly attributed to him; yet it was only to be expected that the sermon would refer, even depend, on the lessons read shortly before it was delivered. The collection of historical and homiletic material signalled by France represents, probably, a similar combination of lessons and sermon consecrated to the liberation of Jerusalem, though the venue of that particular Liberation feast is still to be determined.⁵⁸

The factual narratives of that victory served as an introduction to the items that highlighted its real meaning. The sequence (no. 68) focuses on the divine dimension of that victory, manifested in its miraculous nature. The few were victorious over thousands because the real battle was waged between the 'Immaculate Lamb' and the 'Demoniac vicious wolves', between Pagan *superbia* and Christian *humilitas*. The crusaders who followed their Supreme *Dux* and 'Unique

⁵⁵ It is a complete vindication of the hypothesis formulated by Hill and Hill, that the manuscripts of the collection Fulcher-Walter-Raymond preserve an edition destined for liturgical purposes: 'cet ensemble dût être réuni sous la forme d'un lectionnaire, pour des lectures pieuses' (*Le 'Liber'*, p. 28).

⁵⁶ B (Kohler's edition, p. 429). The extension of the celebrations to these two stations is not documented prior to BV, but both manuscripts refer to it as an already existing custom.

⁵⁷ C. Kohler, 'Un sermon commémoratif de la prise de Jérusalem par les croisés attribué à Foucher de Chartres', *Revue de l'Orient latin* 8 (1900-1901) 158-64.

⁵⁸ See note 15. France ('An Unknown Account', 783) locates it in the abbey of Ripoll.

Emperor' to the holy places in a *nova milicia* (a term better known from the not dissimilar development of this theme by Bernard of Clairvaux), were granted this victory by God: 'Venit hec victoria a Christi potencia benedicta.' The poet prays God to complete what He had begun, 'Ut sub tua custodia pax crescat et victoria'.

This view of God as the Victorious Lord of Hosts, Liberator and Saviour of Jerusalem, is further highlighted through several psalms and antiphonal texts. The service opens with Vespers Invitatory (no. 1), which announces 'Ecce nomen Domini venit de longinquo...ad perdendas gentes in nihilum', and the next antiphon (no. 3) calls 'Leva, Jerusalem, oculos, et vide potentiam Regis: ecce Salvator venit solvere te a vinculo'. Psalm 8:3 (no. 21) lauds God 'Ex ore infantium et lactantium perfecisti laudem propter inimicos tuos ut destruas inimicum et ultorem', and a responsory (no. 29) recalls the promise fulfilled in the Liberation: 'Jerusalem, cito veniet salus tua. Quare moerore consumeris?... Salvabo te et liberabo te, noli timere.' The refrain to that responsory echoes the crusaders' descriptions of the Liberation as an act of purification from pagan abominations: 'Israel si me audieris, non erit in te deus recens, neque adorabis deum alienum: ego enim Dominus.'

The ambivalent nature of the crusade as a *peregrinatio*, comprising the notions of pilgrimage as well as holy war, finds ample expression in the Liberation service. The first three psalms in the Vespers office are *cantica graduum*, canticles originally sung by the pilgrims on their ascent to the Temple Mount, and this choice was certainly intentional, for the entire service seems to have been designed primarily with the Jerusalem pilgrimage in mind. The pilgrims are specifically mentioned in the Collect: '. . .et praesta ut quisquis eam civitatem petiturus ingreditur, cuncta se impetrasse laetetur' (no. 17), and in the Secret: '. . .ut quicumque fideles istam civitatem. . .ingrediuntur' (no. 71). The sequence, again, allows for a better understanding of this notion of pilgrimage. It presents it, in the first place, as a duty to praise God and to pay the honour due to his Sepulchre. The emphasis on duty and obligation is unmistakable: 'Redde sancta civitas laudes Deo debitas. . .Ecce honor debitus est sepulchro redditus. . . . Nunc munus persolvitur atque laudum hostia' (no. 68). Pilgrimage to Jerusalem is also the way of salvation, for the pilgrim hopes to merit forgiveness at the end of his pilgrimage. This idea appears in the poet's reference, in an almost direct quotation from Is 60:4, to the numerous pilgrims arriving daily from abroad: 'Ecce tui filii et filie de longinquo veniunt cotidie/ Ad te porta glorie pro culparum veniam.' The most impressive expression of this aspect of the feast is provided, however, by the rich collection of psalms, antiphons and other items. The immense joy, exaltation and gratitude felt by the pilgrim on arriving at Jerusalem is transmitted by such texts as Ps 121:1-2: 'Laetatus sum in his quae dicta sunt mihi, in domum Domini ibimus. Stantes erant pedes nostri in atriis tuis Hierusalem' (no. 2), and, again, in the two antiphons quoting Is 60:6 and 2:3: 'Omnes de Saba venient aurum et thus deferentes et

laudem Domino adnuntiantes' (no. 14); 'Venite ascendamus ad montem Domini, quia de Sion exivit lex, et verbum Domini de Jerusalem' (no. 15). This theme practically dominates the Vespers office, but it also strongly colors Matins and Lauds, though they are mainly consecrated to the celebration of the salvation and glory of Jerusalem.

One observes, in fact, an impressive adoption of the traditional attributes of Old-Testament Jerusalem in the new Christian city, with none of the reservations and qualifications that were evolved during centuries of mainly spiritual interpretation of Jerusalem as a reality and as a concept. This service revives biblical Jerusalem in its choice of Scriptural texts. The Vespers office recreates the emotions of separation and longing felt by God's people when exiled from Jerusalem: 'Super flumina Babylonis illic sedimus et flevimus cum recordaremur Sion...quomodo cantabimus canticum Domini in terra aliena; si oblitus fuero tui Hierusalem oblivioni detur dextera mea' (Ps 135:1, 4-5; no. 8). The Liberation is seen, therefore, as the Return of the Exiles: 'Levabit Dominus signum in nationibus, et congregabit dispersos Israel, In convertendo Dominum captivitatem Sion facti sumus sicut consolati' (Antiphon and Ps 125:1; nos. 5, 6). It should not be too difficult to perceive the underlying theological assumptions. These Vespers items recall the captivity of Jerusalem and its liberation, the dispersion of the Israelites and their return to Jerusalem, in close association with the theme of pilgrimage. It is clear that each individual pilgrim, and the Church as one collective body, are seen as reliving the Separation and Return prefigured in the Old Testament history of Jerusalem. Yet it is hard to distinguish clearly between prefiguration and fulfillment in texts which refer to an earthly Jerusalem in both ends of the same continuum — an earthly Jewish Jerusalem prefiguring an earthly Christian Jerusalem. No theologian could have had any difficulty in interpreting the following responsory: 'R. Sicut mater consolatur filios suos, ita consolabor vos, dicit Dominus; et de Jerusalem, civitate quam elegi, veniet vobis auxilium; et videbitis, et gaudebit cor vestrum. V. Dabo in Sion salutem, et in Jerusalem gloriam meam' (no. 49). Yet its resonance was certainly quite different when sung in Sion. Our service provides us, therefore, with an excellent example of the extent to which these two concepts could merge, and even become mutually identified, in twelfth-century Jerusalem.

Jerusalem is represented, in this service, as the final destination and goal of the Christian pilgrim. It could be understood in a literal sense, and it was of course interpreted in this way. It could also be seen, on another level, as signifying the quest of the individual — and of the Church — for salvation in Jerusalem. This quest was frequently designated as *peregrinatio*, or *iter*. It was frequently seen as an *Imitatio Christi*. The sequence, as before, clarifies the liturgist's thinking on this point, by pointing to the *iter* opened by Christ to his followers: 'Adoremus resurgentem iter nobis facientem ad regna celestia' (no. 68). The adoption of

liturgical items mainly from the feasts of the Nativity, Epiphany and Easter conformed to this idea, for in the course of these feasts the worshipping community shared the experience of *imitatio Christi* in the authentic historical surroundings of these events, in Jerusalem and its near vicinity. The Liberation service attempts, therefore, to combine the pilgrim's personal quest of salvation with the collective experience of salvation of the Christian Church and society, and to focus them in an earthly, Christian Jerusalem. It was an innovation, and the crusaders were certainly conscious of the innovative character of their enterprise, despite their interest in the historical antecedents to the crusade itself and their establishment in Jerusalem. Raymond and Fulcher translated their experience of the liberation in terms of a new canticle, a new song of praise to the Lord; no wonder, therefore, that our liturgist expressed his feelings similarly in terms of a Dedication: the new earthly Jerusalem was assimilated to a new church, with the rich cluster of ideas and sentiments that became associated with that term in twelfth-century Europe.

The Hebrew University Jerusalem.

PARAPHRASE EDITIONS OF LATIN MATHEMATICAL TEXTS: *DE FIGURIS YSOPERIMETRIS*

Wilbur R. Knorr*

THE medieval Latin tradition of mathematical science was founded, in major part, on a core of works first translated in the twelfth century. Particularly significant was the Arabo-Latin tradition, represented most notably by the translations of Gerard of Cremona¹ and Adelard of Bath.² But some translations, such as those made at Sicily, were based directly on Greek sources.³ The work of primary interest for the present discussion, the *De figuris ysoperimetris*, falls within

* I am indebted to Professor Marshall Clagett for providing me microfilm copies of manuscripts, and to Mr. Mark L. Darby (Historical Studies Library, Institute for Advanced Study), who assisted him in making these copies. Additional copies of manuscripts have been obtained through the courtesy of the Bodleian Library (Oxford), the Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale (Florence), and the Österreichische Nationalbibliothek (Vienna). Among those who read this paper in draft, Hester Gelber (Stanford University) has been especially helpful with her comments and recommendations. I wish to acknowledge also the support of the National Science Foundation for a grant under which the first version of this paper was completed.

¹ On Gerard's life and work in general, see R. Lemay, 'Gerard of Cremona' in *Dictionary of Scientific Biography* (hereafter *DSB*), 16 vols. (New York, 1970-79), 15.173-92. The medieval list of Gerard's translations is translated and discussed by M. McVaugh in *A Source Book in Medieval Science*, ed. E. Grant (Cambridge, 1974), pp. 35-38. Since Lemay's survey, H. L. L. Busard has issued a critical edition of Gerard's version of the *Elements* (*The Latin Translation of the Arabic Version of Euclid's Elements Commonly Ascribed to Gerard of Cremona* [Leiden, 1984]), and I have prepared a study of his rendition of Thābit ibn Qurra's treatise on the balance, the *Liber karastonis* (*Ancient Sources of the Medieval Tradition of Mechanics*, Florence, 1982).

² For a summary of Adelard's life and work, see M. Clagett, 'Adelard of Bath' in *DSB* 1.61-64. Adelard is the focus of a collection of essays (*Adelard of Bath: An English Scientist and Arabist of the Early Twelfth Century*, ed. C. S. F. Burnett [Warburg Institute, Surveys and Texts 14; London, 1987]). On his translation of the *Elements* see note 5 below.

³ For a survey of this Sicilian group, see C. H. Haskins, *Studies in the History of Mediaeval Science*, 2nd edition (Cambridge, Mass., 1927; rpt. New York, 1967), ch. 9. Critical editions of some of these translations have appeared: Proclus' *Elementatio physica*, edited by H. Boese in *Die mittelalterliche übersetzung der Stoiheiois physikê des Proclus* (Berlin, 1958); Euclid's *Optics*, edited by W. R. Theisen in 'Liber de visu: The Greco-Latin Translation of Euclid's *Optics*', *Mediaeval Studies* 41 (1979) 44-105; *Data*, edited by S. Ito in *The Medieval Latin Translation of the Data of Euclid* (Tokyo and Boston/Basel/Stuttgart, 1980); and *Elements...from the Greek*, edited by H. L. L. Busard in *The Mediaeval Latin Translation of Euclid's Elements...from the Greek* (Stuttgart, 1987).

this Greco-Latin tradition.⁴ Such translations, whether from Greek or Arabic, posed real obstacles for Latin students. Laced with terminology simply transliterated from the alien tongues (e.g., 'mutekefi', 'meguar', etc., from Arabic, 'paralelos', 'diametros', etc., from Greek), or imbued with the stubborn ellipticism of technical Greek, these translations would present a certain obscurity to those unfamiliar with the base languages.

Accordingly, there arises in the thirteenth century a genre of Latin paraphrases whose intent, one can perceive, was to facilitate the study of these technical works by recasting them into conventional Latin. Typically, the paraphrasing editor retains (or only minimally alters) the statements of the propositions in his source, but revamps the proofs. In addition to substantially or even completely rewording the source proofs, substituting familiar expressions for conspicuously un-Latin terminology and syntax, and other linguistic modifications, he may introduce technical modifications as well: delete superfluous items or supply new ones (e.g., proofs of steps assumed in the source, or citations of Euclidean theorems). The genre proliferates, as subsequent Latin editors prepare their own editions based on prior paraphrases. This is the pattern one sees, for instance, in the family of revisions emanating from the translation of Euclid's *Elements* made by Adelard of Bath, where the primary translation ('Adelard I', in the nomenclature introduced by Marshall Clagett) appears in a variety of paraphrases (e.g., 'Adelard II', 'Adelard III').⁵

⁴ A critical edition has been prepared by H. L. L. Busard, 'Der Traktat *De Isoperimetris*, der unmittelbar aus dem griechischen ins lateinische übersetzt worden ist', *Mediaeval Studies* 42 (1980) 61-88. The ancient prototype of this work originates with Zenodorus (second century B.C.) and is represented in three extant versions, one by Pappus of Alexandria, another by Theon of Alexandria, and the third by the anonymous compiler of the 'Introduction to the *Almagest*'. The medieval version is based directly on the third (see section I and notes 18-19 below). There is an overview of the technical and textual questions relating to the ancient isoperimetric tradition in my *Textual Studies in Ancient and Medieval Geometry* (Boston/Basel/Berlin, 1989), part III, chap. 10. Prior discussions of the mathematical content invariably focus on the versions in Pappus or Theon (e.g., T. L. Heath, *A History of Greek Mathematics*, 2 vols. [Oxford, 1921], 2.206-213), while the older discussions of textual aspects have been superficial at best.

⁵ For a general overview of the medieval versions of the *Elements*, see J. E. Murdoch, 'Euclid: Transmission of the Elements' in *DSB* 4.437-59. The standard schema of the Adelardian tradition was proposed by Clagett ('The Medieval Latin Translations from the Arabic of the *Elements* of Euclid', *Isis* 44 [1953] 16-42), and its notable features are outlined by J. E. Murdoch ('The Medieval Euclid: Salient Aspects of the Translations of the *Elements* by Adelard of Bath', *Revue de synthèse* 89 [1968] 67-94). The primary version in this group, that called 'Adelard I', has been edited by H. L. L. Busard in *The First Latin Translation of Euclid's Elements Commonly Ascribed to Adelard of Bath. Books I-VIII and Books X.36-XV.2* (Studies and Texts 64; Toronto, 1983); and a critical edition of 'Adelard II' is in preparation by H. L. L. Busard and M. Folkerts. Recent studies have emphasized the great complications involved in sorting out the Adelardian tradition; see in particular, Folkerts, 'Adelard's Versions of Euclid's *Elements*' in Burnett, *Adelard of Bath*, 55-68; and R. Lorch, 'Some Remarks on the Arabic-Latin Euclid', also in Burnett, *Adelard of Bath*, 45-54. Equally complex is the problem of sorting out the various Arabic versions by al-Hajjāj and other translators,

The sheer bulk of the *Elements* (amounting to 364 propositions in the version 'Adelard II') and the large number of variant forms have hampered the project of determining the textual relationships among the Adelardian versions. More amenable to such a comparative study are shorter writings, like Archimedes' tract in three propositions, *On the Dimension of the Circle*. Its Latin translation, *De quadratura circuli*, by Gerard of Cremona, gave rise to many paraphrase versions, of which at least a dozen survive, discovered and edited by Clagett.⁶ From Clagett's editions I have recently pieced out a genealogical scheme for these versions through the analysis of their textual correspondences.⁷ Remarkably, only one of the adaptations turns out to be based directly on Gerard's translation, namely the text I will call the 'Florence Version'; two others branch off directly from this one, the 'Cambridge Version' and 'Naples Version', and the remaining ones from these.⁸

Similar inferences can be made about the variant forms of the geometric work, *De curvis superficibus*.⁹ Although its colophon names the author, one Johannes de Tinemue (that is, John of Tynemouth),¹⁰ this appears to be a paraphrase, based

on which the Latin versions depend; an ample account of the Arabic versions is given by M. F. Sezgin, *Geschichte des arabischen Schrifttums*, 9 vols. (Leiden, 1967-84), 5.83-120. In a sequel to the present article I will take up the thirteenth-century paraphrases 'Adelard IIIA' and 'IIB' and their connection to version II (see notes 29, 37 and 77). The definitive medieval edition of the *Elements* was prepared by Campanus of Novara around 1255-59, on the basis of the Adelardian line (see G. J. Toomer, 'Campanus of Novara' in *DSB* 3.23-29); this was the first form of the *Elements* ever to be issued in a printed edition (Venice, 1482).

⁶ For critical editions of *De quadratura circuli* and paraphrases, see M. Clagett, *Archimedes in the Middle Ages* [to be cited as *AMA*], vol. 1 (Madison, 1964), chap. 2.2, 3, 5 and 6, and vol. 3 (Philadelphia, 1978), pt. 2, chap. 1, and App. I, sect. 2. Archimedes' tract was also translated from the Greek by William of Moerbeke (1269) and Jacob of Cremona (c. 1453), and both versions gave rise to paraphrases; see Clagett, *AMA* 2; vol. 3, pt. 1, ch. 5; vol. 3, pt. 3, ch. 1; vol. 5, App. I (pp. 483-85). This Greco-Latin line of the work will not concern us further here.

⁷ *Textual Studies*, pt. III, ch. 9; as most of the paraphrases are limited to prop. 1, my present remarks bear on that part of the work only.

⁸ The 'Cambridge Version' paraphrases only props. 1 and 2; the 'Naples Version' (like most others) only prop. 1. The 'Florence Version' covers all three propositions, and attaches a second paraphrase of prop. 1 as well; accordingly, Clagett labels the propositions IA, IB, II and III in his edition. Presuming that an editor would have no reason for including two different paraphrases of the same proposition, Clagett takes this version to be composite, and so calls it the 'Florence Versions'; but he chooses not to specify how many versions (if more than two) have been juxtaposed here, or which propositions go together. From an analysis of the style, however, I infer that a single editor is responsible for all four propositions (see *Textual Studies*, pt. III, ch. 9). One can only conjecture why prop. 1 received double treatment, and it is certainly possible that the secondary version (namely, prop. IB) was originally intended to stand apart from the others. The important result for us here, however, is the common authorship.

⁹ For the critical edition see Clagett, *AMA* 1, chap. 6. I discuss the work in 'The Medieval Tradition of Archimedes' *Sphere and Cylinder*' (*Mathematics and Its Applications to Science and Natural Philosophy in the Middle Ages. Essays in Honor of Marshall Clagett*, ed. E. Grant and J. E. Murdoch [Cambridge, 1987], pp. 3-42), and *Textual Studies*, pt. III, ch. 8.

¹⁰ Clagett suggests the possibility of identifying this figure with a certain Oxford archdeacon who died about 1221 (*AMA* 1.720 and 3.1253-54). But I argue through other considerations that he was instead a prominent teacher and mathematical editor, active c. 1225-65 (see section VI).

on a lost Greek adaptation of Archimedes' *On the Sphere and Cylinder*.¹¹ This Latin version includes stylistic changes and pedagogical glosses assignable to its own editor, but the core seems based on a Greek source. In his edition of *De curvis*, Clagett notes a paraphrase version, of which he has edited one section.¹² My survey of *De quadratura circuli*, mentioned above, has brought to light certain additional conclusions about *De curvis*: that its author, John of Tynemouth, is the editor responsible for the 'Florence Version' of *De quadratura circuli*, and that the editor of the paraphrase version of *De curvis* produced the 'Cambridge Version' of *De quadratura*.¹³

My objective now will be to undertake a similar survey of the extant versions of *De figuris ysooperimetris*, in order to determine the source relations linking them to one another as well as to the versions of *De curvis superficiebus* and *De quadratura circuli*. I hope through this to initiate the project not only of explicating the aims and procedures of the paraphrasers, but also of identifying them and their sphere of activity.

For convenience of reference, I list here the texts to be considered, together with the principal manuscripts preserving witness to them. The abbreviations will be used throughout this paper.

FY: the Greco-Latin translation; my citations are from the critical edition by H. L. L. Busard ('Der Traktat *De isoperimetris*'). Of the eight extant copies consulted by Busard ('Traktat', 62), I mention these three: Oxford, Bodleian Library Digby 174, fols. 135r-136v (s. xiii); Florence, Biblioteca Nazionale, Conv. soppr. J. V. 18, fols. 4rb-5vb (s. xiv); Vienna, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek 5277, fols. 231r-236v (1525).

I will consider the following paraphrase versions (see the listing by Busard, 'Traktat', 64-65):

FY₁: Oxford, Digby 174, fols. 178v-179r.

FY₂: Florence, J. V. 18, fols. 96v-97v.

FY₃: Vienna, 5203, fols. 142r-146r, s. xv (in the hand of Regiomontanus, and attributed by him to Jordanus de Nemore).

FY₄: Florence, J. V. 18, fols. 11ra-12va.¹⁴

¹¹ This is in essence the view of Clagett (*AMA* 1.440-42); see also my studies as cited in note 9.

¹² *AMA* 1.446, 530-47. The portion edited constitutes three new propositions appended to the text of CS by the paraphrasing editor.

¹³ *Textual Studies*, pt. III, ch. 9.

¹⁴ An alternative proof of prop. 4, appearing in place of the expected form in one copy of FY (Vienna 5277, fol. 234r-v), is identical (but for scribal discrepancies) to prop. 4 of FY₄. Busard provides the text as an appendix to his edition of FY ('Traktat', 87-88), but he does not mention its agreement with FY₄. By virtue of this agreement, one cannot cite this proposition as evidence that the copy in Vienna 5277 depended on that in Vienna 5203, as Busard attempts to do ('Traktat', 63). For the fact that the variant of prop. 4 in the former copy (otherwise attesting to FY) resembles that

FY₅: Florence, J. V. 30, fol. 12v, s. xiv (a fragment, preserving only the first seven lines of prop. 1).

FY₆: Florence, J. V. 18, fols. 5vb-6rb (an alternative proof of prop. 1, appended to the Florence copy of FY).

QC: *De quadratura circuli*, Archimedes' tract on circle measurement in the Arabo-Latin rendition by Gerard of Cremona (ed. Clagett, *AMA* 1, chap. 2.2). Clagett notes two copies of 'tradition I' and ten of 'tradition II' (*AMA* 1.37-38); of the latter, as comparison with Busard's list of manuscripts indicates, three also hold forms of *De ysoperimetris*, among them Oxford, Digby 174 (fols. 133v-134v).

QC-F: *De quadratura circuli* in the 'Florence Version' (ed. Clagett, *AMA*, chap. 3.3), extant in three copies: Florence, J. V. 30, fols. 9v-12v, and two subordinate exemplars (*AMA* 1.98).

QC-C: *De quadratura circuli* in the 'Cambridge Version' (ed. Clagett, *AMA*, chap. 3.1), extant in three copies (*AMA* 1.66): Cambridge, Gonville and Caius College, 504/271, fols. 108v-109v, s. xiii; London, British Library, Royal 12.E.xxv, fols. 150v-151v, c. 1300 (apparently copied from the preceding); Florence J. V. 18, fol. 93r (lacking prop. 2 and some lines of prop. 1).

CS: *De curvis superficiebus* (ed. Clagett, *AMA*, chap. 6.2), extant in eleven copies (*AMA* 1.446-49), of which five also hold forms of *De ysoperimetris*, e.g., Oxford Digby 174 (fols. 174v-178r), Florence J. V. 30 (fols. 1r-4v).

CS₂: a paraphrase version of CS, extant in Florence J. V. 18, fols. 93r-96v. Several coincidences in the contents of these manuscripts are suggestive in the light of the textual comparisons to be given below. Two of the paraphrases I have assigned to a common editor, QC-C and CS₂, appear consecutively in the same Florence manuscript (J. V. 18), and are immediately succeeded by FY₂, which I will argue is due to the same editor (see section III). Furthermore, CS and FY₁ occur in immediate succession in the same Oxford manuscript, Digby 174, where there also appears a copy of the *Elements* in the version 'Adelard III' (fols. 99r-132v); this will lend support to another argument on authorship (section II). Two codices hold multiple copies of *De ysoperimetris*: Oxford Digby 174 holds both FY and FY₁, while Florence J. V. 18 holds FY, FY₂, FY₄ and FY₆.

NOTE ON CITATION CONVENTIONS

In the passages below I cite the source version FY according to proposition and line number in the edition of Busard.¹⁵ Similarly, I cite the versions QC-F and CS

in the latter (attesting to FY₃) is merely a corollary of the dependence of FY₄ itself on FY₃ (see section IV).

¹⁵ This entails a certain redundancy, since Busard's lineation is continuous; but indicating the proposition number facilitates comparison with the paraphrases.

by proposition and line, and QC-C by line, according to Clagett's editions. Although Clagett's two principal manuscripts of QC-C occasionally differ from the third copy (in Florence J. V. 18), the one of particular interest for us here, the differences appear to be due only to the carelessness of the scribe.¹⁶ Citing CS₂ and the paraphrase versions of FY is complicated, since none is yet available in a modern version. For these I will cite the line numbers within each proposition as in the unique manuscript preserving the text (thus, '4.8' denotes the eighth line of prop. 4), where I assign to the propositions the numbers of the corresponding parts of the critical editions of CS (Clagett) and FY (Busard).¹⁷ One may observe that in CS₂ prop. 11-13 form an appendix to the ten propositions it shares with CS, so that these have no counterpart in the source. Since Clagett has edited these appended propositions, I will cite them according to his edition.

Following the precedent of its Greek prototype, FY inserts the statement and proof of a lemma into the middle of its third proposition. Since the medieval convention is to enunciate propositions in large letters, the numerical sequence of propositions is thereby disrupted, in that what becomes counted as prop. 4 splits prop. 3 into two separate parts. In FY (rendering the Greek) the resumption of prop. 3 is signalled by the phrase 'hoc prelibato demonstrabitur quod modo propositum' (ed. Busard, lines 128-130), and a similar strategy is followed in FY₁. But in the other versions the second part of prop. 3 is articulated as if it were a new proposition, that is, with its own enunciation written in large letters. Accordingly, in my own references to all versions, including FY and FY₁, I will signify the two parts of this proposition as 'prop. 3a' and 'prop. 3b', where prop. 4 falls between them. Uniquely among the versions, FY₂ also divides its second proposition into two parts with separate enunciations; for this version only I will distinguish between 'prop. 2a' and '2b'. In terms of their physical layout, then, FY₂ appears comprised of nine propositions, FY and FY₁ of seven, and the remaining versions of eight. Despite this difference in numbering the content and order of the propositions is the same for all versions.

In my transcriptions, I employ the following symbols: parentheses denote my filling out of abbreviations or ellipses; angled brackets ('<...>') indicate my suggested additions, correcting possible scribal deletions; square brackets indicate my own editorial explications; specifically, '[?]' signals a questionable reading,

¹⁶ Most conspicuously, the copyist omits prop. 2 and the closing line of prop. 1. He also omits any heading for CS₂, so that QC-C and CS₂ run together, as if to comprise a single work. Throughout the text of QC-C, there are inadvertent omissions and miscopyings; Clagett notes a few of these (*AMA* 1.65), but refrains from fully collating its variant readings with those of his other two manuscripts.

¹⁷ Note that most of the manuscripts of both works omit numbers for the propositions. Nevertheless, a numerical scheme is assumed in citations of CS in other works, like CS₂ (that is, in the appended props. 11-13) and in the paraphrases of *De ysoperimetris* (prop. 7 in FY₁, FY₃ and FY₄).

either because illegible or carelessly written, and '[!]' signals a scribal variant, such as a misspelling or incorrect word. In cases of the latter, I insert the likely correct word, if that is not obvious.

I

The provenance of the basic form of the text of *De figuris ysoperimetris* (FY) is clear, for it agrees word for word with an extant Greek tract, *Peri isoperimetrôn*, constituting a chapter of the anonymous *Introduction to Ptolemy's Syntaxis*.¹⁸ One of the copies of the *Introduction* (namely, in the tenth-century codex, Venice, Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana, Marc. gr. 313, fols. 1r-28r) precedes the copy of the *Syntaxis* that J. L. Heiberg has shown served as exemplar for the Greco-Latin translation made at Sicily around 1160.¹⁹ Since *De ysoperimetris* is rendered in the same literal manner as the Ptolemy translation, indeed, sharing with it many of its characteristic renderings of Greek words, one reasonably infers that both were produced within the same scholarly circle, quite likely by the same translator.²⁰

I propose to argue now that the Oxford paraphrase FY₁ is based directly on the literal rendering FY, and that FY₁ is in its turn the source for the Florence paraphrase FY₂. In the next section, I will argue that the Oxford version is due to the same editor as CS and QC-F (namely, John of Tynemouth), and in section III that the Florence version is due to the same editor as CS₂ and QC-C.

Both FY₁ and FY₂ retain the wording of all the enunciations as in FY, but FY₁ is notably the more faithful and extensive in its repetitions from FY, whereas FY₂

¹⁸ The most extensive discussion of the *Introduction* to date is by J. Mogenet, *L'introduction à l'Almageste* (Mémoires de l'Académie de Belgique; Brussels, 1956) 51, fasc. 2; Mogenet's position on the authorship of this work is scrutinized in my *Textual Studies*, pt. I, ch. 6. No critical edition of the Greek text has yet appeared, however, and only portions have been edited at all. With respect to its chapter on isoperimetric figures, the Greek text that F. Hultsch has included in his edition of Pappus' *Collection* (*Pappi Alexandri Collectio*, 3 vols. [Berlin, 1876-78], 3.1138-65), although based on an inferior manuscript (Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vat. gr. 184), is suitable for provisional purposes. I examine this isoperimetric tract in comparison with the versions by Pappus and Theon in *Textual Studies*, pt. III, ch. 10.

¹⁹ J. L. Heiberg, 'Eine mittelalterliche übersetzung der Syntaxis des Ptolemaios', *Hermes* 45 (1910) 57-66; and 'Noch einmal die mittelalterliche Ptolemaios-übersetzung', *Hermes* 46 (1911) 207-216; for remarks on the Latin translator's use of this manuscript, see also Haskins, *Mediaeval Science*, pp. 157-65. The Venice manuscript is the best extant Greek text for this portion of the *Introduction*, and — along with Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vat. gr. 1594 — preserves the best extant witness to the *Introduction*, as well as to Ptolemy's *Syntaxis*.

²⁰ For instance, FY consistently writes 'quare' for Greek 'hōste'. This and other preferences in rendering typify the Sicilian translations; for specimens and discussion, see J. E. Murdoch, 'Euclides Graeco-Latinus. A Hitherto Unknown Medieval Latin Translation of the *Elements* Made Directly from the Greek', *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 71 (1966) 266; and S. Ito, *Medieval Latin Translation*, pp. 23, 30, 34. In line with a position advanced by Ito, I believe that FY and the other works in this group (see note 3) are due to a single translator; this view will be discussed separately.

favors abridged statements. The wording of the resumption of prop. 3 (that is, 'prop. 3b') offers a particularly clear parallel:

FY: Hoc prelibato demonstrabitur quod modo propositum, hoc est quoniam maiora sunt ANG, EXZ trigona quam ABG, DEZ. (ed. Busard, 3b.128-134)

FY₁: Hiis prelibatis erit ostendere quod paulo ante distulimus, s(cilicet) quod trigona similia maiora sint contraque dissimilibus. (fol. 179r, 3b.1)

FY₂: *Trigona ysoperimetra dissimilibus equalium <laterum> similia dissimilibus maiora esse.* (fol. 96rb, 3b.1-3)

The text I mark off from FY₂ in italics (in the manuscript it appears in large letters, thus signifying the enunciation of a separate proposition) corresponds to a portion of the statement of prop. 3a earlier in FY₁ ('...et demonstrare quoniam similia contraque maiora dissimilibus'). FY₁ adheres precisely to the sense of FY, but inclines to paraphrase (only 'prelibatis' has an exact literal correlate in FY, and even here FY₁ substitutes the plural for the singular in FY). Despite these differences it is clear in these passages (as is typical of the enunciations overall) that FY₁ follows the model of a source like FY, while FY₂ follows one like FY₁. For other specimens one can compare the statements from prop. 1 in App. I and prop. 6 in App. II.²¹

In the handling of the proofs, however, both FY₁ and FY₂ are loosely paraphrastic, so that verbatim correspondences like those just cited are infrequent. Nevertheless, there is a structural correspondence linking the general course of the proofs in FY₁ to those in FY, and similarly FY₂ to FY₁, while occasional literal parallels can be discerned. It will be clearer to survey the two pairs separately.

In prop. 1, FY₁ seems to rephrase and explicate FY freely, although only rarely do literal parallels mark equivalent steps: e.g., 'a duplici pari' (FY₁ 1.9) for 'per equale' (FY 1.19). Similarly, the phrases 'hoc postea probabitur' (FY₁ 1.10) and 'sicut ostendetur' (FY 1.21) refer in both to the lemma appended to prop. 1 (see texts in App. IV). In this lemma, FY₁ amplifies into a complete proof what is a mere sketch in FY; although the methods are identical, it is difficult to point to clear correspondences in the wording or the order of their proofs.

In prop. 2, FY₁ manifests a concern to transform the almost unintelligible literalism of FY into a more familiar mathematical idiom: e.g., in FY the phrase

²¹ Another instance occurs in the enunciation of prop. 5, where FY₂ agrees with FY₁, 'eque multa latera habentium', while FY reads 'eque multitudinis laterum' (ed. Busard, 'Traktat', line 174). But an exception to this pattern is that FY₂ preserves FY's 'et circulis contentorum' where FY₁ writes 'et circulis inscriptibilium superficierum' in the enunciation of prop. 1. One must thus allow that the editor of FY₂ has some cognizance of FY directly, although I find no other clear sign of it elsewhere in FY₂. There is a similar coincidence between FY₂ and FY₃ in the enunciation of prop. 1 and another in the lemma at the end of prop. 1 (see App. I and IV). This seems too little to indicate FY₂'s knowledge of FY₃ (or vice versa), but may indicate some textual mixing by the scribes.

'propter AE equaliter posse AD et DE' (2.49) renders the elliptical Greek 'dia to tèn AE ison dynasthai tois AD, DE' (ed. Hultsch, 1144.10-11), whereas FY₁ rephrases 'quadratum EC valet quadrata ED et DE' (2.3). But 'dempto communi' in FY₁ (2.7) echoes 'communi ablata' in FY (2.65), and the two versions are in good structural agreement, especially in the second half of the proof.

The same paraphrastic correspondence marks prop. 3-5. FY designates the sum of two lines with the qualifier 'velut ab uno' (rendering Greek 'hòs apo mias') in prop. 4 and 3b, while FY₁ employs equivalent phrases, 'tamquam unius' (in 4) or 'quasi essent unum' or 'velud unum' (in 3b), but at different points of the proof. Where FY has 'commune auferatur' (3b.161; cf. 163) FY₁ has the equivalent 'dempto communi' (3b.10-11; cf. 11), and where FY has 'communia bis apponantur trigona utrique' (3b.169-170) FY₁ has 'addito triangulo utrique' and 'addito communi, s(cilicet) triangulo' (3b.13-14).

In prop. 5, FY₁ follows the argument of FY with minor adjustments: for example, the reference polygon in FY is taken to be a hexagon, but in FY₁ a pentagon. Further, in the second part of the proof, FY₁ introduces a pertinent qualification absent from FY, that the chosen unequal angles of the polygon must be non-adjacent ('oppositi'); FY₁ then attaches a lemma to the effect that such a choice is always possible.

Full texts of both versions of prop. 6 appear in App. II. One can see their firm agreement, often literal, in the steps labelled [1] through [5]. But FY₁ simply assumes the result for which FY provides a full argument in [6]. The two versions agree on steps [7] through [11], although FY₁ reverses the order of [8] and [9], and FY₁ omits the equivalent of FY's steps [12]-[14]. Overall, this proposition is a sample of particularly light editing on the part of FY₁.

In prop. 7, FY₁ also adheres recognizably, if somewhat loosely, to the order and terminology of FY, as the following excerpts reveal:

FY Intelligatur primum solidum contentum sub conicis superficiebus ... Intelligatur enim in solido spera inscripta ... Adiaceat ergo circulus equalis superficiei solidi AB, et intelligatur ab AB conus altitudinem habens eam que ex centro inscripte solido spere. Equalis ergo est solido. Hoc enim est demonstratum ab Archimenedi. (7.244-252)

FY₁ ... Intelligatur ergo solidum conicarum superficierum ABC ... Inscribatur spera solido secundum duodecimum Elementorum ... Adiaceat vero circulus equalis superficiei solidi, intelligaturque conus cuius altitudo sit semidiameter HI ... Erit ergo KLM equale poliedro ABC, secundum vii^{am} Archimenedis. (7.2-4)

Thus, in addition to ordering the argument in the same way as FY, FY₁ retains specific terms, like 'intelligatur' and 'adiaceat', in the equivalent positions, and includes the same reference to Archimedes. Moreover, both FY and FY₁ embed within the proof a lemma on the volume of the sphere; from the text given in App.

III it is evident that the two treatments are in close structural and verbal correspondence.

In its adaptation of the proof of prop. 7, however, FY₁ makes two changes that can be viewed as errors. First, by attaching the phrase 'secundum falsigraphum' (7.3) it attempts to formulate the proof in the indirect manner, even though the actual proof, both here and in FY, is direct. Second, FY₂ applies the term 'poliedrum' to the Archimedean solid of revolution (7.4), which it first introduces as 'solidum conicarum superficierum, equilaterum et equiangulum' (7.4), whereas a polyhedron can only have *planar* boundaries. Apparently, the paraphraser has misunderstood the phrase FY uses for the conical solid, 'solidum contentum sub conicis superficiebus. . . cuius generatio erat polygoni inscripti in circulo', for it is only this generating *polygon* which can be termed 'equilaterum et equiangulum', not the resultant solid. The conflation of terms by FY₁ has the effect of combining into one the two isoperimetric results proved in FY prop. 7 (first for the sphere in relation to the Archimedean solids, then for the sphere in relation to the regular polyhedra).²²

In sum, FY₁ reproduces verbatim the enunciations and some associated passages from FY and adheres to the method and general order of its proofs. Although FY₁ exercises considerable freedom in rewording the proofs, e.g., substituting standard terminology for the Graecisms of FY, adding steps or revising their order, etc., it never strays far from the pattern of FY.

A similar pattern of correspondences links FY₂ to FY₁. As noted above, the enunciations in FY₂ are abridged, but reflect the wording of FY₁ where that diverges from FY.²³ In the proofs the correspondence is sometimes quite loose (as in prop. 2, 3a and 4), but at other points reasonably close (e.g. parts of prop. 1 and 3b, as also 5 and 6), while the incidence of equivalent phrases is actually higher than those connecting FY₁ to FY. I cite first some passages of prop. 1 as specimens:

FY₂ dico ergo quod exagonus est maior (1.8-9); FY₁ ostendere exagonum esse maiorem pentagono (1.3); FY dico quoniam maius est AB quam GD (1.6-7)

FY₂ item que est proportio lateris ad totum ambitum ea anguli ad iiii rectos (1.13-15); FY₁ ergo que est <proportio> K totalis <anguli> ad 4 rectos est K sue basis ad totalem perimetrum (1.7); FY et sicut ergo GD ad ABP perimetron ita GZD ad 4 rectos (1.17-18)

²² On technical grounds this conflation is permissible. For both solids are special cases of the configuration where all the interior lines drawn from a designated point (the 'center') perpendicular to the surface are equal; a solid of this type is equal in volume to a cone whose base equals the surface of the solid and whose height equals any of those interior lines (see my *Textual Studies*, pt. III, chap. 10 for additional remarks). But the ancient isoperimetric writers seem quite unaware of this more general aspect, and I find it unlikely that the medieval editor of FY₁ did either.

²³ See note 21, however, for a passage suggesting some direct connection between FY₂ and FY.

FY₂ hoc probatur inferius (1.23); FY₁ hoc postea probabitur (1.10); FY sicut ostendetur (1.21)

In these excerpts, FY₂ manifests an affinity with the wording of FY₁, even as the three versions happen to conform well in sense. The terminology for proportions ('que proportio...ea...') used here by both FY₂ and FY₁ is typical of their manner throughout, in contrast to the alternative preferred in FY ('sicut...ita...'). The third specimen looks ahead to the lemma attached at the end of prop. 1 (for comparative texts, see App. III). In the lemma, FY₂ follows the revised order and amplified manner that FY₁ has substituted for that in FY.

In prop. 3a, FY₂ at one point seems closer to FY:

FY₂ ergo iste sunt tres lineae quarum quilibet due tertia sunt longiores (3a.20-22); FY quare et rectorum EZ, KM, ML due qualescumque sumpte reliqua maiores sunt (3a.92-93)

FY₁ has no precise equivalent at this point. But the wording of FY₂ is modeled not on FY, but on the pertinent proposition of the *Elements* ('Adelard I'): 'quomodo de tribus lineis...quarum quilibet due simul iuncte reliqua tertia fuerint maiores, triangulum faciamus' (I 22, ed. Busard). Indeed, FY₂ gives an explicit citation to the *Elements* ('per primum') in its very next line, where the correspondence to FY₁ becomes apparent:

FY₂ Ergo ex eis potest esse triangulus, per primum ... potest probari quod erit infra DEF, quia ... (3a.22-23, 25-26); FY₁ Ergo ex IL et G et AC potest fieri triangulus et concurrent infra triangulum ABC, quoniam ... (3a.6-7); FY Constituatur ergo ex tribus quidem AG, IT, TK trigonum ANG, ex tribus vero EZ, KM, ML trigonum XEZ. Manifestum enim quoniam N quidem superius quam B cadit, at vero X inferius quam D, propter ... (3a.93-96)

FY₁ organizes this section of the proof differently from FY: relative to the comparison of the two triangles ANG and XEZ, FY first covers all the necessary inequalities of lines (cf. 3a.89-90: 'rectorum AG, IT, TK due qualescumque sumpte reliqua maiores sunt', and similarly for lines EZ, KM, ML at 3a.92-93), then constructs the two triangles from them in tandem ('ex tribus quidem...ex tribus vero...'), then states the relative configurations of the vertices for each in terms of the given pair of triangles ('N quidem superius...at vero X inferius...'). By contrast, FY₁ brings together all the details bearing on one pair of triangles (DFM in relation to the given DFE), then runs through all the analogous details for the second pair (as above, ANC in relation to the given ABC). FY₂ follows the order of FY₁. Moreover, FY merely states the isoperimetry of the two pairs of triangles at an intermediate point in this proof; by contrast, FY₂ argues this result in quite different terms as the conclusion of the second part of prop. 3a, and so again appears to follow the precedent of FY₁:

FY₂ ysoperimetri sunt predictis [?] quia latera horum sunt IK et latera illorum eadem et bases eedem (3a.35-36); FY₁ ^{iiii^{or}} latera istorum pariter accepta valent 4 latera illorum ... ergo manentibus basibus eisdem, isti trianguli primis sunt isoperimetri (3a.10); FY trigona vero ANG et XEZ ... ysoperimetra eis que sunt ABG et EDZ (3a.96-97)

In the course of prop. 3b one must show that a certain line is not collinear with another:

FY₂ item probatur quod ex linea GK et MK non sit linea una recta sic (3b.12-13); FY₁ cum EH non sit una linea recta cum DH, quod post erit probandum (3b.3); FY que (TE) manifestum quoniam non est in directo recte BE ... (3b.141-144)

Thus, FY₂ shares 'non sit linea una recta' with FY₁, in contrast to FY's 'non est in directo'. Furthermore, the proof given in FY₂ is direct in form, comparable to the more ample argument (also direct) in FY₁: where the latter writes 'ratione compositionis (angulorum)', for instance, the former considers 'anguli compositi'. By contrast, FY inserts a brief remark, indirect in form.

For the rest of prop. 3b, FY₂ continues to follow the manner of FY₁:

FY₂ dempto communi LI ... ergo demptis hinc inde maius est AG quam EB (3b.29-30) ... sed illud quod fit ex ductu AG in LK est duplum ad trigonum ACG, quod potest vidi ... (3b.34-38) ... a simili illud qualigonium [!] ... est maius illo qualigonio ... (3b.42-44)

FY₁ dempto communi, s(cilicet) quadrato KI, ... ergo demptis communibus EK et IF, erit ED linea maior FG (3b.10-11) ... sed quod fit ex ductu ED in KB est duplum ad triangulum DEB, ut patet per primum Elementorum (3b.12-13) ... ergo hoc kaligonium est maius illo kaligonio (3b.13)

FY commune auferatur quod ab GI, ... communes auferantur BG, XI, ... ille que sunt BG, XI a coutraque ..., hoc enim facto et bis ablatis BG, XI ... maior quidem NB, minor vero DX (3b.161-165) ... quod sub NB, GE ... maius ergo NBE trigonum ... (3b.167-168) ... totum ergo ABEN kilogonium maius quam EXZD kilogonium trigonum (3b.168-169)

In these excerpts from the latter part of prop. 3b, FY₂ imitates the wording of FY₁, where FY phrases differently. Where FY₂ and FY₁ both state the product rule for the area of the triangle ('quod fit ex ductu...'), which FY tacitly assumes, the passage beginning 'quod potest vidi' in FY₂ (to be quoted more fully in section III) summarizes the argument based on *Elements* I 37 that FY₁ alludes to in its citation ('ut patet...').

In the following lines of prop. 5, bridging the two parts of the proof, FY₂ again imitates the wording of FY₁:

FY₂ relinquitor ergo quod si sit maximum, sit equilaterum. Sed probo quod oportet quod sit equiangulum ... Oportet ergo quod anguli compositi [!] sicut [!] sint]

inequales (5.18-22); FY₁ oportet ergo quod pentagonus sit equilaterus. Quod sit equiangularis sic ostendetur: aut oppositi <anguli> erunt equales aut inequales (5.4-5); FY non ergo anisopleuron est. Dico autem quoniam neque anisogonium est (5.195-199)

Presumably, 'compositi' in FY₂ is a scribal error for 'oppositi' (as in FY₁); FY₂ thus appears to take over the terminology of FY₁, where, as noted above, that corresponds to a special elaboration of the argument by the editor of FY₁.

In prop. 6, FY₂ conforms well to the model of FY₁, especially in the latter part of the proof. The comparative texts given in App. II reveal the agreement on 'semidiameter (maior est) semidiametro' in step [7], the construction 'hoc...illud...' in steps [9] and [8], as well as their shared order for these steps, in contrast to the reversed order in FY. Indeed, the correspondence here between FY₂ and FY₁ is almost verbatim:

FY₂ Ergo maior [! maius] est id quod fit ex ductu AC in ambitum circuli quam quod fit ex ductu P in ambitum polygonii. Sed hoc duplum circuli, illud duplum polygonii. Ergo maius est duplum circuli quam duplum polygonii. (6.15-19)

FY₁ Ergo quod fit ex ductu AC in AB circumferentiam maius est eo quod fit ex ductu GB in DEF perimetrum. Sed hoc est duplum circuli, illud duplum polygonii. Ergo duplum duplo maius. (6.4-5)

FY Et est quidem quod sub TI et perimetro polygonii duplum polygonii, quod vero sub GB et perimetro circuli duplum circuli. Maius ergo duplum duplo. (6.236-238)

Furthermore, both FY₂ and FY₁ merely state the rule for the circle in [9], and omit the Archimedes citation that FY gives in [13]-[14]. At step [6], FY₂ supplies an explanation where FY₁ is tacit, and in doing so, FY₂ has in effect restored an omission made by FY₁ from FY (see above); but the method adopted in FY₂ is unrelated to that in FY.

In prop. 7, FY₂ appears to follow FY₁ in the two errors that FY₁ has introduced there by way of modifying FY. Just as FY₁ mistakenly conflates the cases of the Archimedean conical solid and the regular polyhedron, by employing 'solidum...' and 'poliedrum' as synonyms, so FY₂ eliminates the 'solidum' altogether, although it confusingly retains the polygon employed in its construction:

FY₂ Sit ergo data sphaera ABC et sit polig(onium) [! poliedrum] isoperimetrum illi DEF, et sit equilaterum. Dato polygonio equilatero circulum inscribere (potest) per x [! xii] Eucl(idis). Inscribatur ergo KNM. (7.2-5)

FY₁ Intelligatur ergo solidum conicarum superficierum ABC, equilaterum et equiangularum, sphaera DEFG isoperimetrum, quod sit maius vel equale sphaera, secundum falsigraphum. Inscribatur sphaera solido, secundum duodecimum Elementorum. (7.2-3)

FY Intelligatur primum solidum contentum sub conicis superficiebus ... cuius generatio erat polygonii inscripti in circulo ... Esto vero tali solido spera ysoperimetra ... Intelligatur enim in solido spera inscripta. (7.244-249)

As indicated by the phrase 'sit maius vel equale spere, secundum falsigraphum', FY₁ conceives the proof to be indirect. This mistake is later reflected in a very similar line of FY₂: '(spera) est contenta in poli(edro) quod est equale spere, secundum adversarium' (7.6-7). Also in agreement with FY₁, FY₂ here supplies the reference to Euclid.

The proof in FY₂ is defective after line 9, for the scribe mistakenly recopies the last eight lines of his prop. 6 in place of the whole remaining part of prop. 7. Comparison with FY₁ provides an explanation for this error. We have seen that in prop. 6 both versions omit the citation of Archimedes' circle measurement given by FY in prop. 6; but in prop. 7 they now both cite the same result where it is absent from FY:

FY₂ Inde sic, spera est maior spera, ergo est <autem maior> quadruplo ad maximum eius circumum, et hoc per primam de quadratura circuli. (7.8-10)

FY₁ Item, superficies spere DEFG quadrupla est ad maximum circumum eiusdem, secundum vi^{am} Archimedis [sc. De curvis superficiebus], quod facile demonstrabitur, mediantibus quadrangulo ... et triangulo orthogonio ... qui equatur eidem circulo, ut ostenditur Arch(imenes) in quadratura circuli. (7.8-10)

Presumably, the correct text of FY₂ followed a reasoning like that given in this passage from FY₁ (to be cited more fully in section II). But the scribe, having introduced the result on the surface of the sphere, instead of next citing *De curvis superficiebus* (prop. 6) as in FY₁, skips at once to the citation of *De quadratura circuli*. Since the aim in this passage of FY₂ is to derive from the inequality of the spheres the correlative inequality of their radii, that is, the analogue of the result for unequal circles argued in prop. 6 (step [6], as in App. II), the similarity of wording in what would follow at this point of the proof of prop. 7 to that in prop. 6 can account for why the scribe now substitutes the one text for the other.

In the light of this survey, the affinity of FY₂ to FY₁ is evident. Although the editor paraphrases extensively, as if to mask this dependence as much as possible, the structure of his proofs rarely deviates from FY₁, while the template of FY₁'s particular phrasing is often retained, sometimes even verbatim. A similar paraphrastic relation links FY₁ to FY, although the editor of FY₁ tends to be more adventurous in his reorganization and rewording of the source proofs than is the later editor responsible for FY₂. The affinity of FY₁ to FY implies that the parallels between FY₁ and FY₂ subordinate the latter to the former. Furthermore, the readings in FY₁ are sufficient to explain all the places where FY₂ conforms to FY.²⁴

²⁴ A possible exception, however, is the phrase of prop. 1 mentioned in note 21. On a possible connection with FY₃ see the text of the lemma to prop. 1 in App. IV.

It is thus possible to describe FY_2 as an adaptation made from the single source FY_1 .

II

Conformity of structure and parallelism in wording have revealed FY_1 to be a direct adaptation from FY . A different kind of comparative analysis permits the identification of its editor. Correspondences in editorial style link FY_1 specifically with the 'Florence Version' of *De quadratura circuli* (QC-F) and with *De curvis superficiebus* (CS), such that it can be assigned to the same editor, John of Tynemouth.

Busard has already observed that the editor of FY_1 appears to know CS: both works employ the term 'falsigraphus' when their proofs are in the indirect manner; moreover, in its prop. 7, FY_1 cites by number theorems 6, 7 and 8 of 'Archimedes', in agreement with the corresponding propositions of CS.²⁵ Indeed, the connection is even firmer than Busard's comment suggests, for FY_1 cites prop. 6 of CS thus:

FY_1 [a] Item superficies spere DEFG quadrupla est ad maximum circulum eiusdem spere, quod facile demonstrabitur, [b] mediantibus quadrangulo contento sub lineis equalibus diametro et maximo circulo spere DEFG, cui equatur superficies spere eiusdem, secundum vi^{am} Archimedis, [c] et triangulo orthogonio, cuius duo latera angulum rectum continentia equantur semidiametro maximi circuli et maximo circulo spere DEFG, qui equatur eidem circulo, ut ostendit Archimedes in quadratura circuli. (7.8-10)

in close agreement with what appears in CS, prop. 6:

CS [b] Cuiuslibet spere superficies est equalis quadrangulo rectangulo qui sub lineis equalibus diametro spere et circumferentie maximi circuli continetur. (6.1-4) [a] Ex hoc manifestum quoniam superficies spere est quadrupla maximo circulo eiusdem spere. (6.42-43)

and with the citation of *De quadratura circuli* in CS, prop. 1, as also with prop. 1 of the 'Florence Version':

CS [c] Archimedes enim in quadratura circuli ostendit circulum esse equalem triangulo orthogonio, cuius unum laterum rectum angulum continentium equatur circumferentie circuli, reliquum vero semidiametro (1.107-110); cf. QC-F: ... quod omnis triangulus orthogonius, cuius unum latus equatur circumferentie, reliquum latus semidiametro, equalis est ipsi circulo. (IB.1-4)

²⁵ 'Traktat', 64.

In effect, this passage from prop. 7 of FY₁ proves anew the claim in [a], even though the same has been proved in the corollary to CS prop. 6, beginning with its line [a]. While FY₁ is paraphrasing CS, the editorial hand is notably light.²⁶

Busard suggests only dependence on CS, but I wish to advocate the stronger claim of common authorship. Both versions share the following conspicuous points of editorial manner:

(1) Not only the term 'falsigraphus', but also the actual phrases it appears in, are closely similar in both: in FY₁, 'si dicat falsigraphus immo...' (5.2), 'secundum falsigraphum' (7.3); in CS, 'dicat falsigraphus' (1.80), 'dico itaque quod...falsigraphus immo...' (8.64-65), 'quam dixit...falsigraphus' (8.80-81), 'secundum falsigraphum' (1.76, 1.84, 94, 6.39).²⁷

(2) CS adopts a distinctive manner for the labelling of the parts of its proofs: by 'exemplum' it initiates the setting out of the propositions in terms of a particular diagram, by 'dispositio' it begins the elaboration of the necessary auxiliary constructions, and by 'ratio' it begins the proof itself. This pattern is evident throughout CS: 'exemplum' appears seven times (props. 4-6, 8-10), 'dispositio' six (props. 1, 5-6, 8-9), and 'ratio' fourteen (props. 1, 3-10) or 'rationis causa' three (props. 1, 5, 7).²⁸ Moreover, within editorial remarks the constructions are cited via the phrases 'ex dispositione' (5.106, 6.30, 9.16), 'in dispositione' (5.97), and 'maneat dispositio' (1.86, 8.66).

The same terminology for the division of proofs is evident in FY₁: 'dispositio' labels the construction twice (1.4, 17) and also appears in the phrase 'ex dispositione' (3b.4); proofs are initiated by 'ratio' nine times (1.13, 2.3, 7, 9, 3a.4, 3b.7, 5.8, 6.3, 7.7). The term 'exemplum' is absent — indeed, only once is the exposition labelled at all (by 'verbi gratia' at 2.2). But a certain flexibility is consistent with our editor's practice: in QC-F 'dispositio' and 'ratio' are lacking, while expositions are twice marked by 'exempli causa' (II.76, III.4).

Usage in this respect is quite different in other works. Most of the versions of *De quadratura* and *De ysoperimetris* simply omit any such labels. Where they appear, however, alternative terminology is used, e.g. 'probatio' in FY₄ (see section v below). Among the Euclid editions, the terms 'exempli gratia' and 'rationis causa' are ubiquitous in the 'Adelard I' version, as are 'exempli causa', 'verbi gratia', 'demonstratio eius', and 'probatio eius' with Gerard, both translators having a firm precedent in the Arabic terms 'mithâl' and 'burhân'. Only 'Adelard

²⁶ Further aspects of this passage are taken up at the end of this section; see also App. III.

²⁷ CS also employs once the alternative phrases 'ex ypothesi falsigraphi' (3.13) and 'quod mentiatur falsigraphus' (1.33).

²⁸ Of the appearances of 'ratio', eleven occur in the phrase 'ratio, age'; see also item (4).

III' subscribes to the manner of CS, and it does so with such consistency that common authorship is indicated.²⁹

(3) A notable contribution by the editor of FY₁ is the provision of Euclid citations: 'per ultimam vi^a Euclidis' (1.22), 'per primum Elementorum' (3b.12-13; cf. 1.13, 7.3, 11). This usage parallels that in CS and QC-F: although these versions prefer simpler phrases on the model of 'per primum secundi' (CS 1.52, cf. 7.50, 8.72; and QC-F IB.26, 33, 39, 45) or 'per xi duodecimi' (CS 7.110, cf. 7.142, 168, 9.14; and QC-F IB.14, 21, 29), QC-F sometimes expands with 'Euclidis' (e.g., 'per primum decimi Euclidis' at IA.28; cf. 52), while CS often expands with 'Elementorum' (e.g. 'per ix duodecimi Elementorum' at 7.22; cf. 7.37, 45, 63, 83, 10.21). Thus, both forms used in FY₁ are firmly established in QC-F and CS. Since these works are explicitly cited in FY₁, prop. 7, and since FY, the direct source of FY₁, omits Euclidean citations altogether, this stylistic feature links FY₁ to CS and QC-F.

FY₁ also shares with them its manner of internal referencing: it writes 'secundum tertiam huius' (5.6; cf. 5.4), 'secundum proximam' (3b.8) and 'per proximam' (3b.10), just as does CS: 'per tertiam huius' at 5.78 (cf. 5.113, 7.32, 8.42, 9.20), 'per proximam' at 2.29, 4.21, 5.47, 6.19, 37, 8.79, 9.17 (cf. 'per anteproximam' at 10.19 and 'ut in anteproxima' at 7.115). Since QC-F holds but four propositions, one finds there only the appropriately adapted forms 'per priorem propositionem' (II.80) and 'per sequentem propositionem' (II.85).

(4) In addition to the fourteen instances of 'ratio' (eleven times written 'ratio age'), CS marks the steps of proofs by sequential adverbs: most often by 'item' (seventeen times) or 'deinde' (eight times), less frequently by 'similiter' (five times: 4.33, 5.22, 105, 115, 6.29), 'amplius' (three: 2.34, 7.48, 114), 'rursum' (twice: 5.68, 8.21), or by the phrases 'simili ratione' (four times: 5.24, 59, 70, 7.131; cf. 'simili demonstrationis progressu', 7.160), 'eadem ratione' (three times: 1.53, 54, 5.27), or 'eodem modo' (once: 5.92); common alternatives like 'inde' and 'iterum' are absent.³⁰ FY₁ manifests a similar pattern of preference: in addition to 'ratio'

²⁹ This item of stylistic agreement suggests the possibility of the common authorship of 'Adelard IIIA' and *De curvis*; I will argue this view in a sequel to the present article.

³⁰ With respect to sequential phrases of this latter sort, QC-F in part resembles CS: 'eodem modo' (twice: IA.24, 58), 'simili modo' (IA.48), 'similiter' (IA.55), also 'supradicta ratione' (IA.21), 'hoc modo' (III.50); we also encounter 'inde' (IA.44). A difference with CS is that in QC-F 'item' is infrequent, appearing only four times (II.77, III.28, 181, 304), while alternatives like 'amplius', 'rursum', 'deinde' are absent, and in general, the frequency of sequential terms overall is low. But there is a conspicuous exception: in III 'iterum' appears 18 times (lines 24, 55, 78, 79, 96, 158, 176, 192, 219, 220, 221, 251, 253, 266, 280, 306, 315, 342), where in every instance the context is arithmetic glosses that explain the derivation of numbers reported in the main text, and that end with a phrase like 'let us return'. It may be that arithmetic writing differs from geometric in certain respects like this; or perhaps the author of QC-F has farmed out the arithmetic details to an associate and then incorporated the results into his proof. At any rate, it is only in the arithmetic parts of prop. III that QC-F markedly differs from the manner of CS.

(nine times) and 'age' (once at 1.18), it employs 'item' liberally (eight times: 2.6, 3a.4, 5, 10, 4.4, 6, 7.4, 8), but otherwise only one occurrence each of 'deinde' (3b.3), 'eadem ratione' (2.6), 'eodem modo' (5.6).

(5) FY₁ resembles CS and QC-F in the manner of its interpolated remarks signifying conclusion; here, forms of 'probare' and 'ostendere' predominate, as one would expect, but also forms of 'liquet' and 'constat'. In FY₁ we read 'quod liquet ex dispositione' (3b.4) and 'quod liquet' (7.7), parallel to lines in CS like 'ex hoc liquet' (6.54) and 'ex hoc liquet theoremate' (3.36). Again, in FY₁: 'constat ergo de proposito' (5.10); in CS: 'sic prior pars constat propositi' (5.66-67; cf. 5.90-91, 8.26, 86-87); in QC-F: 'hec conclusio sic constat' (III.175). The line in FY₁, 'eodem modo potest probari' (5.6), specifically parallels a line in CS, 'eodem modo poterit probari' (5.92), while another line in FY₁, 'erit ostendere quod paulo ante distulimus' (3b.1), is likewise close to one in CS, 'per id quod paulo ante...probavimus' (8.48). One perceives the similar manner of the lines 'quod facile demonstrabitur' (FY₁ 7.8), 'facile patebit propositum' (CS 2.22) and 'facile invenire poteris' (QC-F III.23). Further, in FY₁ the line 'quod preostensum est' (5.8) recalls an idiom in CS, 'ut preostensum est' (5.89, cf. 7.89, 147).

(6) In accordance with the formal geometric style, third-person and impersonal verbal forms predominate in all three writings (with conventional exceptions, like 'dico'). But they also allow a scattering of second-person forms: in FY₁ 'et habebis...age...' (1.18) and 'collige' (7.12); in CS, 'invenies' (5.59), 'si sufficienter enumeres, reperiēs' (5.63-64), 'proba' (5.113), 'si memineris priorum' (7.155); in QC-F, 'attende' (II.82), 'fac...concludes' (IB.56), 'facile invenire poteris' (III.23), 'si diligenter inspicis, videbis' (III.182), 'sic probabis' (III.238), 'si priorum memineris' (III.292).³¹

(7) The following coincidences of usage associate FY₁ with CS and QC-F: [a] when FY₁ speaks of the 'axis' of a cylinder (7.5), a precedent can be found not in FY, but in CS (10.11; cf. 5.38, 46, 47, 111, 7.24, 9.10); [b] similarly, when FY₁ speaks of a pyramid as 'fundata supra basem' (7.5), the precedent is not with FY, but CS (7.164; cf. 1.83, 7.102, and analogously for the cube, 10.8); [c] when FY₁ constructs an arc 'intra maiorem circulum' (1.17), or a pyramid 'intra priorem piramidem' (7.7), the parallel is not in FY, but CS ('poligonium intra circulum', 3.9, 3.10); [d] to designate the operation 'di' isou', which FY renders by 'per equale' (1.19), FY₁ writes 'a duplici pari' (1.9), just as CS (9.23; cf. 'a pari', 7.107, 10.17); [e] just as FY₁ speaks of 'oppositi anguli', that is, angles at opposite sides of a polygon (2.6-7, 5.5), so does CS (5.96); [f] just as FY₁ speaks of 'partiales anguli' (six times at 1.8-11, twice at 3b.5-6), so does QC-F (III.143); [g] to

³¹ Second-person forms are pervasive in prop. III of QC-F, particularly in the arithmetic glosses. This may be another respect, then, in which arithmetic writing differs from the idiom standard in geometry (see the preceding note).

express the addition of terms, where FY writes 'sumpta' (3a.90, 92), FY₁ writes 'pariter accepta' (four times in prop. 3a.5-10), as in CS (1.65, 67, 69, 70, 88, 2.17) and QC-F (IA.20, 26, 29, III.58).³²

(8) FY₁ initiates prop. 7 in good textual agreement with its source FY, as this excerpt reveals:

FY₁ [1] Intelligatur ergo solidum conicarum superficierum ABC, equilaterum et equiangulum, [2] spere DEFG isoperimetrum ... [3] Inscribatur spera solido secundum duodecimum Elementorum. [4] Protrahaturque HI semidiameter illius spere. [5] Adiaceat vero circulus equalis superficiei solidi, [6] intelligaturque conus cuius altitudo <sit> semidiameter HI, sitque piramis illa KLM. [7] Erit ergo KLM equale poliedro ABC, secundum vii^{am} Archimedis. (7.2-5)

FY [1] Intelligatur primum solidum contentum sub conicis superficiebus ... [2] Esto vero tali solido spera ysoperimetra.... [3] Intelligatur enim in solido spera inscripta, ... [5] adiaceat ergo circulus equalis superficiei solidi AB [6] et intelligatur ab AB conus altitudinem habens eam que ex centro inscripte solido spere. [7] Equalis ergo est solido. Hoc enim est demonstratum ab Archimedi. (7.244-252)

One readily observes the shared terminology ('intelligatur', 'adiaceat', etc.), the identical citation of Archimedes, and the conformal ordering of steps, with only minor adjustments by FY₁ (e.g., the explicit drawing of the radius as HI in [4], with the consequent abridgment of [6]).

FY₁ continues in agreement with FY as both texts next insert what amounts to a lemma on the volume of the sphere (namely, that it equals a cone whose base equals the surface of the sphere and whose height equals its semidiameter). Within this lemma two additional citations of 'Archimedes' occur in both texts, where in FY₁, as we have seen at the beginning of this section, there is close verbal agreement with passages from CS prop. 6 and 8. But the lemma is identical with prop. 9 of CS, whose proof conforms to the structure of FY.³³ This raises the puzzle, why the editor of FY₁ bothers to present the whole lemma, with its

³² In FY, we also find 'insimul accepta' (1.2 bis, 3a.4); and similarly in QC-F prop. III 'simul' is twice used to denote addition (lines 131, 132), although the most frequent term is 'coniuncta', possibly inspired by the model of Gerard's translation (cf. QC 3.92 and the correlative passage QC-F III.17). Among the Archimedean texts edited by Clagett, the term 'pariter accepta' (or 'sumpta') marks QC-F, CS and texts based on them (namely, the 'Naples Version'); see *AMA* 1.702 (index). Other versions adopt the variant 'simul sumpta' (cf. Clagett, *AMA* 1.706). An exceptional instance is 'pariter accepta' in Albert of Saxony's *Questio* (*AMA* 1.414, line 165), where it falls within a quotation from the Euclidean version 'Adelard II' (namely, V 1, possibly via Campanus; *AMA* 1.432); the term does not appear at the analogous place in the versions of Gerard or 'Adelard I'. The Euclidean connection recommends caution. But we can still cite this as evidence that FY₁ shares its terminological preference with QC-F and CS.

³³ See App. VI for the comparative texts in CS, FY and FY₁. I compare these portions of CS and FY also in 'Medieval Tradition of Archimedes' *Sphere and Cylinder*, 14-15 and in *Textual Studies*, pt. III, ch. 8.

citations of CS prop. 6 and 8, when by citing its prop. 9 he could dispense with it altogether. Presumably, he sees it as his commentatorial duty to preserve the content of FY.³⁴ In any event, in this lemma, as throughout the remainder of the proof, he follows the structural model of FY more closely than in any other proposition.³⁵ Nevertheless, the verbal parallelism with CS prop. 9 is apparent, as the opening lines of the lemma reveal (the full text appears in App. III):

FY₁ *Intelligatur columbia quedam, cuius basis equatur maximo circulo spere DEFG, axis vero diametro DF, eritque columbia sexquialtera ad speram, secundum octavam eiusdem [sc. Archimedis]. (7.4-5)*

CS *Sumatur etiam columbia cuius basis sit equalis maximo circulo spere C et GH eius axis sit duplus ad DC, ... ergo columbia GH est sexquialtera ad speram C, per proximam [sc. prop. 8]. (9.8-10, 16-17)*

FY₁ has a precedent for 'intelligatur' from the source FY, as our previous excerpt shows; otherwise, the wording is modelled on that in CS, even to the citation of the same theorem (prop. 8 of *De curvis*) at precisely the same point. The treatment in FY is phrased quite differently:

FY *Quoniam enim demonstravit [sc. Archimedes] quod cylindrus basim habens maximum circulum altitudinem dyametrum spere sesquialter est spere. (7.260-261)*

Despite the verbal affinity with CS, FY₁ proves this lemma in accordance with the sequence of FY at points where CS diverges: for instance, FY and FY₁ state the 'sexquialtera' relation immediately after defining the cylinder, and then state the 'sextupla' relation of the cylinder and the cone; by contrast, CS reverses the order of these steps. Thus, even though FY₁ agrees unmistakably with CS in the manner of phrasing, it does not appear to be based directly on CS, but rather on FY, for its organization of this proof.

This seems paradoxical: the editor of FY₁ seems to be following FY for the structure of the proof, but CS for its phraseology; while he is broadly paraphrastic in his treatment of FY, he seems slavishly imitative of CS. The same pattern of divided paradigms (FY for content, CS for style) and inconsistent level of editorial fidelity is evident also in the seven other items we have surveyed above. On the view of common authorship for CS and FY₁, however, this pattern is not paradoxical at all — it is precisely what we would expect.

³⁴ One should recall the ostensibly superfluous double presentation of Archimedes' circle theorem in QC-F IA and IB.

³⁵ This is the case notwithstanding the two errors introduced by the editor of FY₁ (see section 1). In effect, FY₁ prop. 7 preserves the beginning of the first part of FY (on the Archimedean solid), moves to the lemma, and then finishes with the latter part of the end of FY (on the polyhedron).

III

By a similar method of stylistic comparisons we can link the composition of FY₂ with CS₂ and QC-C, as in the following items:

(1) In prop. 3b FY₂ effects the same technical step as in a section of QC-C:

<p>FY₂ quod potest vidi si ducatur a puncto G equidistans L linee et equalis, et quia illud parall(elogramu)m et ille triangulus sunt inter lineas equidistantes super eandem basim, ergo illud est duplum ad triangulum, trigonum ACG. (3b.35-40)</p>	<p>QC-C ducatur itaque a puncto contactus duorum laterum linea equidistans basi illius trianguli et fiat parallelogramum. Ille triangulus et illud parall(elogramu)m sunt inter duas lineas equidistantes super eandem basim, ergo triangulus est medietas illius per xl primi. (lines 30-33)</p>
---	---

The agreement of wording, 'illud parall(elogramu)m...super eandem basim', is particularly striking.³⁶ The parallel passages in their sources provide little more than the requisite reference to Euclid: 'et probetur hoc per 41^{am} primi quoniam parallelogramum duplum est ad triangulum' (QC-F IB.14-5) and 'ut patet per primum Elementorum' (FY₁ 3b.13-14). Thus, our two passages can be assigned to the paraphrasing technique of their respective editors, so that the similarity of wording is a significant indicator of a common editorial hand.³⁷

Another textual parallel can be noted: FY₂ twice refers to Euclid for the inscription of a circle in a given regular polygon: 'dato poligonio equilatero et equiangulo circulum inscribere <potest> per xii Euclidis' (6.5-7; cf. 7.3-4). In the second case, a precedent exists with FY₁: 'inscribatur spera solido secundum duodecimum Elementorum' (7.3), although it has been misconstrued by FY₂ as the inscription of a *circle*, rather than a *sphere* (see the discussion of prop. 7 in section I above). The wording in FY₂ has a closer parallel in two passages of CS₂: 'secundum s. [! xii] Euclidis, datis duobus circulis, uno includente altero incluso, poligonium in maiori inscribere <potest> quod non contingat minorem' (1.13-15; cf. 2.11-13).³⁸ The reference is to *Elements* XII 16, and is critical for

³⁶ The coincidental use of the abbreviation (*parall'm*) is due merely to the convention adopted by the scribe, who is the same for both copies.

³⁷ The enunciation of I 41 in 'Adelard n' is thus: 'Si parallelogramum triangulusque in eadem basi atque in eisdem alternis lineis fuerint constituta, parallelogramum triangulo duplum esse conveniet' (Cambridge, Gonville and Caius College 504 (271), fol. 33v); the same enunciation is followed in 'Adelard IIIA' and 'IIB'. The phrases 'super eandem bases' and 'inter duas lineas equidistantes' appear in the enunciations of related propositions just preceding (e.g. I 37-40). Note that only 'IIB' ends its proof of I 41 with a phrase like that in FY₂: 'ergo ABCD parallelogramum est duplum ad GBC triangulum' (Oxford, Savile 19, fol. 39r). In general, as I intend to argue in the sequel, the style of 'IIB' is related to that of the trilogy QC-C, CS₂ and FY₂, and so assignable to the same editor.

³⁸ The abbreviation 'per s.' must stand for 'per secundum (librum)'. But 'per duodecimum' is required, as the parallel in FY₁ makes clear. Perhaps the scribe of FY₂ has misread 'xii' as 'ii'. In citing the same proposition at the analogous place in prop. 7, the scribe of FY₂ writes 'per x' instead of 'per xii'.

the limiting proofs in CS₂; despite this, the source CS fails ever to justify the step.³⁹ FY₂'s citation, which must be to the same proposition, is inaccurate, since Euclid constructs a polygon in a given circle (as CS₂ correctly assumes), not a circle in a given polygon.⁴⁰ Nevertheless, both the similarity of wording and the shared perception of a need to introduce the Euclidean citation in this context link FY₂ to CS₂.

(2) Also linking FY₂ and CS₂ is their manner of supplying auxiliary proofs at the end of the propositions where these are assumed in their sources. When this occurs in FY₂ prop. 1, the phrase 'hoc probabitur inferius' is inserted within the main proof (1.19); under the same circumstances, in CS₂ prop. 6, the same phrase is inserted, 'hoc probabitur inferius' (6.26; so also 7.53 and 11.25). Again, to signal that proofs may be supplied by analogy with proofs already given, both versions employ similar phrases with 'prius': CS₂ 1.33 ('deinde ut prius probetur'), 1.34 ('inde ut prius'), 3.30-31 ('probatum est prius'), 7.73 and 7.75 ('ergo ut prius'), 8.81 ('ut prius demonstratum est'); FY₂ 2b.33 ('et sic ut prius'). By contrast, alternative expressions (with 'supra' and 'superius') appear in the source version CS: 'ratiocinando ut superius, proba' (5.113), and 'ut supra probetur' (5.115). Thus, even if the notion of making explicit editorial reference to preceding proofs has been suggested by CS, the specific manner of expression, as CS₂ and FY₂ share, is different from that of CS.

(3) We have seen that CS regularly marks off the parts of its proofs by the terms 'exemplum', 'dispositio', and 'ratio', and that FY₁ reflects the same habit. The terms are absent from the derived version FY₂, as also from CS₂ and QC-C. We have also seen that the source versions signal the sequence of steps in their proofs, and that 'ratio' and 'age' are especially favored terms for doing this. The derived versions exhibit quite different preferences: in particular, the phrase 'inde sic' is practically a stutter in all three — it appears eighteen times in the seven propositions of FY₂ (1.25, 36, 2a.7, 11, 2b.7, 16, 21, 3a.11, 27, 4.13, 30, 3b.17, 5.10, 14, 24, 31, 6.9, 7.7), seven times in the first proposition of QC-C and once in its second (lines 18, 36, 41, 53, 65, 68, 75, 92), and no less than eleven times in the thirteen propositions of CS₂ (1.18, 2.13, 3.10, 22, 4.19, 26, 5.18, 6.38, 7.15, 8.73, 13.11). The expression is not to be found in any of their sources QC-F, CS or FY₁. Similarly, 'inde' by itself is a notable alternative in the derived versions, but is absent from their sources.

³⁹ The inscribed polygon (as in *Elem.* XII 16) is needed for props. 1, 2, 3, 6 and 8 of CS. Although the editor of CS lavishes references to the *Elements* (many of them quite dispensable), he altogether misses these important ones; see my 'Medieval Tradition of Archimedes' *Sphere and Cylinder*, pp. 5 and 39 (note 68). Thus, responsibility for their appearance in CS₂, prop. 1 and 2 must be assigned to its editor.

⁴⁰ The same objection applies to the citation in FY₁, which must intend *Elem.* XII 17 for its introduction of the sphere inscribed in the given solid. But the Euclidean construction is of a polyhedral solid inscribed in a given sphere.

Among the other terms appropriate in this regard, FY_2 often employs 'item' (four times: 1.9, 34, 2b.12, 3b.12); it is particularly striking that both CS_2 and QC-C open with the statement of three postulates, analogous in content and similar in wording, such that the second and third postulates in both are marked by 'item'; beyond this, QC-C employs 'item' once in its proofs (at line 27), while CS_2 does so seven times (5.79, 9.11, 19, 11.19, 29, 13.19, 23). The derived versions share their preference for 'item' with the source versions FY_1 and CS (see item 4 in section II). Both sets also share use of the term 'deinde' as alternative. But the other choices found in the sources, 'amplius' and 'rursus', are absent in the derived versions. Conversely, 'a simili', an unusual phrase absent from the source versions, is notable in the derived versions: once in FY_2 (3b.42), once in QC-C (line 72), and six times in CS_2 (5.23, 28, 7.87, 11.20, 21, 75). If perhaps inspired by the expression 'simili ratione' employed in CS (see section II), it nonetheless provides a clear terminological link among the derived versions.

(4) Both QC-C and CS_2 modify the wording of their sources by opening the proofs of several of their theorems with references to 'given' figures: 'datus circulus' in QC-C (line 13) and CS_2 (1.1); also in CS_2 : 'data curva superficies' (2.5; cf. 6.5, 21, 7.6, 9.5) and 'data spera' (10.6); cf. 'sed datum est quod...' (6.34). These expressions may be considered irregular, for in the formal geometric idiom, terms with 'given', while proper in the enunciation and construction of *problems*, are never used in the statement or proof of *theorems*; the convention is unanimous in the Greek treatises, as also in the Arabic, Hebrew and Latin versions based on them.⁴¹ In FY_2 , forms with 'datus' appear, when appropriate, in its problems ('datus trigonus' in 2a.1, 4; cf. 3a.1, 7); but the irregular usage with theorems, found in QC-C and CS_2 , is also adopted in FY_2 : 'dati trigoni' (4.6 and 3b.4), 'datum polygonium' (6.5) and 'data spera' (7.2). One may note that the source version FY_1 , as well as its own source FY, adheres strictly to the ancient convention.

(6) Another such item arises in prop. 6 (see App. II) where FY_2 denotes by the single letters P and O the perimeters of the polygon and circle, respectively, in

⁴¹ I employ the terms 'theorem' and 'problem' to denote two types of propositions that are formally distinguished throughout the ancient and medieval traditions of geometry: a *theorem* is a general claim about a class of mathematical entities; a *problem* seeks the construction of a particular geometrical entity satisfying certain specified conditions. For example, FY prop. 2 is stated as a problem: 'given an anisosceles triangle, to construct on the same base an isosceles triangle isoperimetric to it' (Busard, 'Traktat', lines 43-44); but FY attaches to this the proof of the related theorem, 'that AZG [sc. the isosceles triangle] is greater than ABG [sc. the anisosceles triangle]' (lines 58-59). In modern accounts, one often distinguishes these two kinds of propositions by observing that theorems take a universal quantifier, whereas problems take an existential quantifier. While sometimes useful, this description is often misleading; see my 'Construction as Existence Proof in Ancient Geometry', *Ancient Philosophy* 3 (1983) 125-48; and *Ancient Tradition of Geometric Problems* (Boston, 1986), chap. 8.

distinction from the standard mathematical convention where single letters denote points only. This same nonstandard notation is a distinctive feature of QC-C, but is not found in the source version QC-F or in any of the other adaptations of *De quadratura circuli*.⁴²

(7) FY₂ employs the phrase 'sed probo quod' (5.19), just as QC-C does twice (lines 27, 38); it does not appear in the respective source versions.

(8) In the expressions for proportion, where the Latin mathematical vocabulary offers multiple options, the paraphrase versions favor the idiom 'que est (proportio) A ad B, ea est G ad D' (where the term 'proportio' is frequently elided) and its alternative with 'eadem' for 'ea': in FY₂ eight times with 'ea' and six with 'eadem' (props. 1, 3a, 4, 6, and 7); in QC-C twelve times with 'ea', once with 'eadem'; and in CS₂ 37 times with 'ea', 22 with 'eadem' (in all thirteen propositions, save 2, 9 and 12). Among alternative expressions, only forms with 'sicut' are notable, appearing eleven times in CS₂ (props. 10-11, 13).

Of their respective sources, FY₁ employs a related form, 'que est proportio...est...', but neither form with 'ea' or 'eadem'. The form with 'ea' does not appear at all in QC-F or CS either, but that with 'eadem' is well marked in both (QC-F, prop. III; and CS, *passim*). Furthermore, QC-F and CS introduce a variety of expressions absent from the other versions: e.g., 'proportio...que...', 'proportio...sicut...', 'quanta...tanta...', while FY prefers the familiar 'sicut...ita...'.

Thus, the paraphrase versions QC-C and CS₂ subscribe precisely to the usage adopted in FY₂, with 'ea' and 'eadem'. Both forms are absent from the source FY₁, and only the form with 'eadem' is paralleled in QC-F and CS.

(9) FY₂ twice uses the phrase 'relinquitur quod...' (5.19, 33) to introduce the premise that remains after the elimination of its logical alternatives (specifically, within the context of an indirect reasoning). The same usage appears twice in QC-C (lines 50, 81) and five times in CS₂ (8.68, 96, 11.61, 98, 13.33-34). Of the sources, neither QC-F nor FY₁ uses the phrase at all, but it is prominent in CS (ten times: 1.72, 97, 101, 3.20, 33, 6.22, 41, 7.172, 8.60, 84). Presumably, the usage within the derived versions has been inspired by this conspicuous habit of CS.

(10) FY₂ uses the phrase 'multo magis' in a short comment added to the proof of prop. 4 (line 32). There is no parallel in FY₁, but the same phrase occurs in QC-C (line 71), for which QC-F offers precedents (e.g., IA.54, IB.48; cf. III.48, 165, 349, 350-51). It is absent from CS and CS₂.

(11) The preceding three items reveal a pattern in which FY₂ shares usage with one or both of the associated versions, QC-C and CS₂, such that the precedent is

⁴² Clagett remarks on the single letter notation of QC-C (*AMA* 1.65; cf. 3.213). On the possible source of this editor's usage, see my discussion of the 'Naples Version' in *Textual Studies*, pt. III, chap. 9.

to be located not with FY_1 (its immediate source) but in one of the parallel sources, QC-F or CS. The view of common authorship implies that the editor of FY_2 is conversant not only with QC-C and CS_2 , but also with all three of the sources. It would thus be possible that FY_2 in some cases might borrow from QC-F or CS usage that is absent not only from FY_1 , but even from QC-C and CS_2 . Just such an instance occurs relative to the phrase 'maneat prior dispositio' in FY_2 (2b.3), for the precedent lies not with FY_1 but CS: 'maneat tota prior linearum dispositio' (1.85; cf. 8.62, 66); no parallel is found in any of the other versions, including CS_2 . This coincidence conforms nicely with the hypothesis of common editorship for FY_2 and CS_2 (the latter being based directly on CS), but would be puzzling without it.

(12) Like the source versions, the derived versions insert appropriate references to the Euclidean textbook. In FY_2 a typical format specifies only the book, e.g., 'per xii Euclidis' (6.7; cf. 7.4), as also in CS_2 (8.36, 11.13; cf. 4.21, 12.5), or more simply, 'per vi' (FY_2 1.28, 46, 4.18; CS_2 5.74, 7.41, 9.27). A more specific format, indicating both the proposition and book numbers, is shared by CS_2 and QC-C, but not FY_2 ; for example, in CS_2 : 'per xi. xii.' (7.50; cf. 9.16), 'per xxiii. v. Euclidis' (10.21), or 'per primam vi. Euclidis' (11.48); in QC-C: 'iuxta primam x Euclidis' (line 20), 'per xl primi' (33, 44, 50, 106), 'per tertiam tertii' (40, 95, 107), 'secundum primam sexti' (70).

Neither format is unusual, and precedents for both are to be found in the sources FY_1 , CS and QC-F (see item 3 in section II). But FY_2 and CS_2 concur in their omission of the alternative form with 'Elementorum', the form that FY_1 and CS favor.

In summary, these items reveal a pattern in which FY_2 shares usage with one or both of CS_2 and QC-C. In most instances, none of the source versions offers a precedent; but in the others, where QC-F or CS does hold a parallel, FY_1 does not. The coincidences have particular force where idiosyncratic phrases are at issue (e.g., 'inde sic', 'a simili', 'maneat dispositio', 'que proportio...ea...', or the irregular use of 'datus'). But even where we are dealing with technical phrases that are not unusual (e.g., 'inferius', 'sed probo quod', 'relinquitur quod'), or indeed, not uncommon (e.g., 'multo magis', 'per primam decimi'), in all these instances the diversity of options offered within the standard vocabulary makes the coincidences significant.

A pattern of agreements on this order can hardly be fortuitous, but must indicate deliberate stylistic coordination. It combines with two other remarkable coincidences relating these three works QC-C, CS_2 and FY_2 : first, that they occur together in the Florence codex J. V. 18, indeed, in uninterrupted sequence and without a heading, a colophon, or even a full stop, to separate one from the next; and second, that their respective sources QC-F, CS and FY_1 manifest a similar stylistic coordination one to another. That mere chance could have resulted in this nexus

of coincidences is hardly to be supposed: the two trilogies must be the work of only two editors, the second adapting the versions produced by the first.

IV

In the present section we consider the derived versions: FY_3 , in the Vienna codex 5203 copied by Regiomontanus; FY_4 , in the Florence J. V. 18; and two fragments — FY_5 in the Florence J. V. 30, and FY_6 in the Florence J. V. 18. By a structural analysis similar to that followed in section I, I intend now to argue that FY_3 is adapted from FY , the primary form of *De ysoperimetris*; that FY_4 is an adaptation of FY_3 ; and that the two fragments are also adapted from FY_3 . In section v, I will attempt to identify their editors.

Collating FY_3 with FY reveals good overall agreement between these versions throughout. In section I, however, we saw a comparable agreement between FY_1 and FY , so that in principle it might be possible for either of the derived versions, FY_1 or FY_3 , to serve as intermediary between FY and the other. This turns out not to be the case. To be sure, the editors' basic strategies are quite similar: they preserve the wording of enunciations with only minor modifications, but in the proofs they recast the clumsy Greco-Latin formulations of FY in accordance with the more familiar Latin idiom, and they occasionally fill out the argument where FY has assumed steps that may not be obvious. FY_1 tends to follow the wording of FY closely for the first few lines of each proof, but then modifies it freely, and often changes the order of the argument as well. By contrast, as we shall see now, FY_3 paraphrases from the very start of its proofs, so that only rarely does it retain overt signs of FY 's wording; but it almost always stays in close conformity with the order of reasoning in FY .

With respect to the enunciations, FY_3 sometimes preserves the text of FY verbatim (as in prop. 2, 3a and 7) or offers a verbatim extract (e.g., in prop. 1 omitting only the introductory formula 'prelibandum vero primum quoniam'); for prop. 6 a modified extract is given (see App. II). The enunciation for prop. 4, however, is rewritten:

FY_3 In trigonis orthogoniis similibus quadratum laterum rectos angulos subtendentium velud unius valet duo quadrata laterum subtendentium acutos angulos ut ab uno, idest insimul sumptorum, et hoc dico lateribus proportionalibus coniunctis.

FY Si fuerint duo trigona orthogonia similia, quod a subtendentibus rectos velut ab uno equale est eis que a reliquis ut ab uno utraque dualitate omologorum. (4.106-108)

In this case, by contrast, FY_1 transmits the wording of FY precisely, save for the addition of 'correlativorum' before 'omologorum'. A similar pattern applies to prop. 5, where FY_3 presents an edited extract from FY :

FY₃ Polygonium quod est maximum omnium sibi ysoperimetricorum <est> equilaterum et equiangulum.

FY Hiis demonstratis proponatur demonstrare quod prius dictum est, quoniam ysoperimetricorum et eque multitudinis laterum rectilinearum maius est quod equilaterum et equiangulum est. (5.173-175)

FY₁ Hiis demonstratis proponatur demonstrare quod omnium isoperimetricarum [sc. figurarum] et eque multa latera habentium rectilinearum maximum est equilaterum et equiangulum.

But for prop. 3b, FY₃ holds more closely to FY than FY₁ does:

FY₃ Hoc prelibato restat demonstrare quod proponit precedens [?] propositio, sc. quod trigona similia sunt maiora dissimilibus sibi ysoperimetricis. *Trigona similia et duum equalium laterum maiora esse trigonis dissimilibus sibi ysoperimetricis.*

FY Hoc prelibato demonstrabitur quod modo propositum, hoc est quoniam maiora sunt ANG, EXZ trigona quam ABG, DEZ. (3b.128-134)

FY₁ Hiis prelibatis erit ostendere quod paulo ante distulimus, sc. quod trigona similia maiora sint contraque dissimilibus.

It is clear that both FY₁ and FY₃ are improvising from the same text FY. As I indicate by italics, FY₃ attaches a formal enunciation, lacking in both the others, as preface to the proof that follows.

With respect to the proof of prop. 1, both FY₃ and FY₁ insert a definition of 'isoperimetra', lacking in FY; in FY₃, this is set before the enunciation of prop. 1, in FY₁ after it; the wordings are not dissimilar, but FY₃ adds the specific example of the regular pentagon and hexagon, which FY₁ lacks (see text in App. 1). In the proof, FY₃ dispenses with some of the minor details in the early steps of FY, and advances more efficiently to the proportionalities; but these are stated similarly to FY:

FY₃ Et que est ADB ad totam suam periferiam ea est anguli ACB ad 4^{or} rectos ... Igitur ex equa proportione que est proportio ACB ad HCI ea est AB ad HI. Igitur ea erit et medietatem. Unde sicut AC ad HG, sive FC, ita angulus AEC ad angulum HCB. (1.17-18, 23-26)

FY Et sicut ergo GD ad ABP perimetron ita GZD ad 4 rectos ... et per equale ergo sicut GD ad AB ita GZD ad AEB, et dimidia ergo sicut GT ad AI, hoc est ad TK, sic <angulus> GZT ad AEI. (1.17-18, 19-20)

The strategy in FY₃ is to clarify the base text of FY by substituting more familiar terminology (e.g., 'periferia' for 'perimetros' and 'ex equa proportione' for 'per equale'), and to supplement the highly elliptical text (e.g., by inserting 'angulus'). This is similar to the approach in FY₁, as the parallels reveal:

FY₁ Ergo que est (proportio) K (anguli) totalis ad iiii^{or} rectos est K sue basis ad totalem perimetrum. Ergo que medietatis K ad 4 rectos est BE ad perimetrum ... A duplici pari ergo que est LE ad LN, cum hec sit illa, est medietatis K ad G partialem. (1.7, 9-10)

FY₁ is here more profuse in its explication than FY₃ and adopts alternative terminology (e.g., 'totalis' instead of 'totam suam', and 'perimetrum', like FY's 'perimetron', instead of 'periferiam'). Where FY₁ modifies the order of FY (for instance, in its earlier placement of the step relating to the halved lines), FY₃ agrees with FY.

Attached to prop. 1 in all three versions is the lemma on ratios of tangents; but it will be best to consider next the subsequent propositions, and then return to the lemma.

The patterns for the subsequent propositions are comparable to that just described: FY₃ stands for the most part in isomorphic relation to the proofs in FY, whereas FY₁ manifests more significant changes. Neither stays close to the verbal model of FY, although one finds occasional specimens of approximate verbal parallelism: for instance, FY₃ 'ablata utrobique' (2.22) corresponds to FY 'communi ablata' (2.64-65), where FY₁ writes 'dempto communi' (2.7). Later, at the end of prop. 2:

FY₃ Igitur triangulus ALC est equalis triangulo AFC; triangulus autem ALC maior est triangulo ABC. Igitur triangulus AFC triangulo ABC maior existens. (2.34-35) [that is, $\text{AFC} = \text{ALC} > \text{ABC}$]

FY Equalis ergo AZG ei quod ALG maiori existenti quam ABG. (2.77-78) [that is, $\text{AZG} = \text{ALG} > \text{ABG}$]

FY₁ Ergo IAC triangulus et AGC sunt equales, sed IAC maior est ABC. Ergo AGC maior est ABC. (2.10) [that is, $\text{IAC} = \text{AGC} > \text{ABC}$]

Thus, although the claims are identical, the compact wording of FY is filled out in the two derived versions, FY₁ being rather more concise than FY₃; only FY₃ retains 'maior existens' as a vestige of FY.

The texts of prop. 6 display a similar pattern of correspondences (see App. II).

In prop. 7, FY₃ again follows the order of FY, but here, unlike elsewhere, it imitates its verbal expressions as well. In some instances, there are extended verbatim agreements; for instance, the opening line of the proof begins thus in FY: 'Intelligatur primum solidum contentum sub conicis superficiebus sicut sumebatur et in eis que Archimenidi cuius generatio'; FY₃ differs only by omitting the two words 'primum' and 'sub', and writing 'Archimenes ostendit [?]' for 'Archimenedi'. As the extract transcribed in App. III shows, the verbal agreement is evident throughout the proof. By contrast, as we have seen in section I, FY₁ follows the verbal manner of FY only in part and modifies its proof extensively; in particular,

it inaccurately conflates the two cases of solids dealt with in FY and phrases the proof as if it were indirect in form. As FY₃ manifests no trace of either change, it must depend on FY without influence from FY₁.

At the three points in prop. 7 where FY merely cites 'the things of Archimedes', however, FY₃ gives explicit references to *De curvis superficiebus* (e.g., 'in 7^a de curvis superficiebus'), similar to those in FY₁ (e.g., 'secundum vii^m Archimēdis' at the analogous point). If we exclude direct consultation of FY₁, we must suppose either that the editor of FY₃ was familiar with *De curvis superficiebus*,⁴³ or perhaps that he knew of these citations through annotations in his copy of FY. Either seems equally plausible, although the latter gains some support from the parallels in FY₄ (see below).

One infers from this survey that FY₃ should be set in direct dependence on FY, so that any coincidences between FY₃ and FY₁ are assignable to the basically similar strategies of the two editors, working independently from the same source. But one portion of the text — the lemma attached to prop. 1 — evades this scheme; as the transcripts in App. iv show, FY₁ and FY₃ stand in unusually close structural (but not verbal) agreement, step for step, where both diverge markedly from the precedent of FY. For instance, both omit FY's citation of Theon in [1], and both supplement FY's mere sketch of a proof with the addition of the same steps in the same order. The presence of the steps I label [3] and [4] is particularly noteworthy, since they appear in none of the dozen or so prior versions that are extant in ancient and medieval sources.⁴⁴

I find this discrepancy difficult to account for. It would be odd for the editor of FY₃, having access to FY₁, to consult it only for this one lemma, and the anomaly would not be removed were we to assign this part of FY₃ to a later scribe (for instance, Regiomontanus). Of the two versions, FY₁ would take precedence over FY₃: the substantial verbatim agreements between FY₁ and FY in the enunciations cannot be accounted for via FY₃; moreover, as we have seen, FY₁ is due to the same editor as *De curvis superficiebus*, cited in FY₃; furthermore, the Digby copy of FY₁ is virtually contemporary with its composition, whereas the Vienna copy of FY₃ is two centuries later. But the lemma at issue has a domain of applicability far wider than the particular context of the isoperimetric tract (and indeed,

⁴³ This is the view of Clagett (*AMA* 3.349) who assumes that Regiomontanus is responsible for these citations.

⁴⁴ For textual comparisons and discussion, see my 'Ancient Versions of Two Trigonometric Lemmas', *Classical Quarterly* N.S. 35 (1985) 362-91; and 'The Medieval Tradition of a Greek Mathematical Lemma', *Zeitschrift für Geschichte der arabisch-islamischen Wissenschaften* 3 (1986) 230-61. Some other versions from Latin sources are noted by Clagett in *AMA* 5.577-80. The same lemma occurs in works associated with Jordanus de Nemore: it is 'prop. 5+' in Clagett's edition of *De triangulis* (part I), while a portion of the lemma appears there as the separate prop. 5 (equivalent to prop. 5 of Jordanus' *Liber Philotegni*); the Jordanian treatments are considered in section v.

alternative forms survive in other treatises; see note 44). Thus, I think it possible that the editor of FY_3 encountered it separate from the rest of FY_1 . In this case, he would reasonably have judged this form superior to that in FY and so used it as his model in place of FY . An account of this sort would suggest some association between the two editors, in that the editor of FY_3 would be assumed to have access to works by the editor of FY_1 , if not to FY_1 itself. I pursue this possibility further in section v.

Turning now to the Florence version, FY_4 , we find its text to be in close agreement with the general course — and in frequent instances with the particular wording — of FY_3 . For instance, all the enunciations in FY_4 are in almost complete verbatim agreement with those in FY_3 , even where the latter differs substantially from the wording in FY and other forms (e.g., for prop. 4, 3b and 5, as noted above). In the proofs, however, the correspondence varies, being sometimes verbatim, elsewhere paraphrastic.

In the proof of prop. 1, for instance, FY_4 initially manifests little verbal agreement with FY_3 , but halfway through the conformity becomes evident and continues so to the end. Among verbal parallels one may note ‘per equam proportionem’ (FY_4 1.27) and ‘ex equa proportione’ (FY_3 1.23); ‘rectus...recto...tertius...tertio’ (FY_4 1.41-42, FY_3 1.35-36); ‘producentia...maiore producentibus’ (FY_4 51-52) and ‘producens...maius sit producente’ (FY_3 44). In the lemma following prop. 1 the agreement is again loose (see App. iv), and stays so through prop. 2. In prop. 3a, however, FY_4 agrees with FY_3 practically verbatim, save for occasional discrepancies, especially at the beginning and the end of the proof. In prop. 4 the agreement is at first loose, but then verbatim for the last third of the proof (that is, the closing eleven lines of both versions). In prop. 3b the openings of the proofs are different; after five lines, however, FY_4 begins to follow the tenor of FY_3 (that is, from the sixteenth line of the proof in FY_3), and six lines later it comes into very close agreement (that is, from line 24 of the proof in FY_3), with frequent literal correspondence. For instance, both proofs end ‘et ita liquet propositum’, then attach a lemma explaining the product rule for the area of the triangle (as assumed earlier in the proof), and then repeat the concluding line ‘ea ita liquet [FY_3 : patet] ultimo probandum’. In prop. 5 FY_4 follows the course of FY_3 , with frequent verbal agreements; e.g., ‘propter hoc impossibile oportet quod datum [FY_4 : dent] polygonum sit equilaterum’ concludes the first part, and ‘non ergo datum polygonum intra omnia sibi ysoperimetra maximum erat, quod est contra ypothesim’ concludes the second part.⁴⁵ Revision is more extensive in prop. 6 (see the comparative texts in App. ii), but the overall

⁴⁵ There are minor scribal variants in FY_4 : ‘in’ for ‘intra’, transposition of ‘maximum’ and ‘erat’, and ‘ysopotisim’ for ‘ypothesim’. FY_3 adds ‘ex hoc conclude propositum’, absent from FY_4 .

agreement is apparent, and there are some striking verbal parallels, as in their shared line 'sed productorum et producentium eadem est proportio' at [10a].⁴⁶

For the whole of its last proposition, however, FY₄ runs in agreement not with FY₃, but with FY, and here, unlike previously, the agreement is absolutely verbatim.⁴⁷ This gratuitous change of source, coupled with the switch to literal fidelity, must surely be due to scribal error on the part of the copyist of FY₄, who is guilty of many similar mistakes throughout the Florence codex (as in FY₂), rather than a feature of his exemplar. But at two places of prop. 7, where FY cites Archimedes, the parallels in FY₄ are slightly different, as if reflecting FY₃. The first reads thus:

FY₄ hoc enim demonstratum est Archim(enidi) au(tem) [?] de curvis superficiebus (7.32-33); FY hoc enim est demonstratum ab Archimenidi (7.251-252); FY₃ hoc enim demonstratur [!] Archimenes in 7^a de curvis superficiebus (7.15-16).

Conceivably, 'au(tem)' in FY₄ is a corruption for 'in vii^a', as suggested by the 'in 7^a' of FY₃. In a second passage, FY₄ follows FY precisely, unlike FY₃:

FY₄ velud colligitur ex eis que Archimenes (7.39-40); FY velut colligitur ex eis que Archimenidis (7.256-257); FY₃ ut colligitur ex eis que demonstravit Archimenes in 8^{va} de curvis superficiebus (7.22-23).

But in a third passage, FY₄ amplifies FY in terms similar to those in the preceding line of FY₃:

FY₄ colligitur ex Archimenide ita quia demonstravit in octava de curvis (7.44-45); FY colligitur ex eis que Archimenes ita, quoniam enim demonstravit quod (7.259-260); FY₃ demonstrat itaque Archimenes loco dicto de curvis superficiebus (7.25-26).

FY₄'s two citations of *De curvis superficiebus* are the only points in prop. 7 where it deviates from the readings in FY, but even here the template of FY is evident. These citations must have appeared, perhaps as annotations, in the copy of FY that the scribe has mistakenly followed in place of his exemplar for FY₄. The Florence codex (J. V. 18) that preserves FY₄ (fols. 11r-12v) also holds a copy of FY (fols.

⁴⁶ It is the agreement in *placement* of this line that is significant. For the line is found elsewhere in FY₄ (1.50-51) and in unrelated contexts in other works, e.g. *De curvis superficiebus* (2.31, 36-37, 10.15-16; cf. 1.113).

⁴⁷ The copy in FY₄ is studded with scribal errors, however, just as elsewhere in the codex; e.g. 'contentis superficiebus' is miswritten for 'contentum sub conicis superficiebus', 'inspecte' for 'inscripte', 'quam' for 'quoniam', 'sexsaltenam' for 'sesquialter', 'non' for 'vero' (often), 'quam' for 'quidem', etc., as well as frequent mistranscriptions of case endings (e.g., 'maximus' for the accusative 'maximum', 'habentem' for 'habens', etc.). The pattern suggests the scribe's uncertainty over abbreviations in his exemplar. There are numerous deletions, and full stops are almost entirely absent (cf. the excerpt in App. 1).

4r-5v), indeed, in the hand of the same scribe. This copy of FY does not include any such citations of *De curvis* in its prop. 7, but it is conceivable that its own exemplar did. Since the copyist would presumably still have access to that exemplar as he went on to copy FY₄, this could be a route for the transmission of the two references.⁴⁸ Alternatively, the anomalous aspects of FY₄ prop. 7 – its use of FY instead of FY₃ and its insertion of the references to *De curvis* – might be assignable not to the Florence scribe, but to his exemplar. But we would then have to account for the same scribal errors in the prior copy, for the anomalies can hardly be a deliberate feature of the original editing of FY₄.

Although our evidence for FY₃ is in the unique copy made by Regiomontanus in the fifteenth century, the existence of the derivative version FY₄ in the earlier Florence codex enables us to date the prototype of FY₃ no later than the fourteenth century. Nevertheless, it may well be the case that the copy preserved by Regiomontanus has incorporated some degree of editorial modification, perhaps even by Regiomontanus himself. One might suppose, for instance, that some of the discrepancies between the two versions FY₃ and FY₄ are due to such editorial changes. In this regard, the following items may be noted: (1) after the enunciation of prop. 2, FY₃ adds the line 'qui probatur alio necessario maior', absent from both FY and FY₄; (2) in this same proposition, FY₃ explicitly describes the manipulation of a compass (2.7-9), but this elaboration is lacking in all other versions, including FY₄; (3) in the enunciation of prop. 3, FY₃ has 'cum primis' in place of FY's 'secundum coutrumque primis' and later omits its 'coutraque', whereas FY₄ preserves the readings of FY; (4) in the enunciation of prop. 4, FY₄ follows the modified wording as in FY₃, save that it retains FY's 'velud ab uno' instead of FY₃'s 'velud unius'; (5) FY₃ recapitulates the statement of prop. 3b at the end of its proof, but FY₄ (like FY) does not; (6) the citation of the 'quadratura circuli', attached to the end of the proof of prop. 6 in FY, but inserted within that proof in FY₄, is missing from FY₃.

⁴⁸ If one collates the two copies in the Florence manuscript against the general consensus of copies of FY (as recorded in Busard's apparatus), one finds that FY₄ typically follows the consensus text (I disregard the scribal errors in FY₄, as mentioned in the preceding note), even where the Florence copy of FY (Busard's 'F') has major discrepancies. For instance, F makes deletions at lines 257-258, 264-266 ('et conus...quadrupla') and line 269, where the text of FY₄ is sound; F writes 'fecit inequaliter' (line 261) instead of 'sesquialiter', while FY₄ reads 'sexsaltenam'; F writes 'intelligitur' (line 270) and 'vult et' (271), where FY₄ reads with the consensus 'intelligatur' and 'velud' (for 'velut'); F employs forms of the name 'Archimedes' where FY₄ agrees with the consensus forms of 'Archimenes'. Thus, FY₄ is not copied from F. But FY₄ shares a few of F's divergent readings: e.g. 'sub rectos' (line 246) instead of the consensus 'sub tetrados' and 'scripta' (line 248) instead of 'inscripta', while instead of the consensus 'autem similiter et' (line 252) F reads 'etiam', similar to FY₄'s 'et'. Furthermore, both versions omit several lines in the same vicinity (lines 262-266), although their omissions only partly overlap ('erit spera ... quadruplus' [lines 263-264]). It seems plausible, then, that the scribe made the copies FY₄ and F from the same exemplar of FY.

These may well be places where the extant copy of FY_3 differs from the older form of the text, but with the exception of (2), and possibly (5), they are hardly more than scribal differences. Of the other more substantial discrepancies noted in the preceding survey of FY_4 , the parallel readings in the extant text of FY_3 generally adhere to the pattern of FY_1 , whereas the alternatives in FY_4 do not. This supports the accuracy of Regiomontanus' witness to his exemplar of FY_3 .⁴⁹

We saw above that FY_3 stands in unusually good agreement with FY_1 in its treatment of the lemma after prop. 1 (see App. IV for the texts). FY_4 lends support to the extant form of FY_3 . The differences between the latter two versions, while considerable, can be assigned to the editor of FY_4 , who appears deliberately to have inverted the order followed in his source and to have introduced other modifications. Nevertheless, it is significant that FY_4 holds the phrase 'unus sector est pars trianguli' in its step [3a], just as FY_3 does, and that it attempts to derive the inequalities by the same two-step procedure as in FY_3 (although I find the reading of the text in FY_4 questionable). In step [5], however, where FY_3 holds 'a fortiori', FY_4 has 'a primo', in agreement with FY_1 . Since we have no reason to associate FY_4 directly with FY_1 , we must suppose that 'a primo' is original with FY_3 (it in fact occurs at 3.24), but has been altered to 'a fortiori' by a later copyist (e.g., Regiomontanus). This further corroborates our earlier finding, that the forms of the lemma in FY_3 and FY_1 somehow have been coordinated, presumably by the editor of FY_3 .

The fragment FY_5 from Florence J. V. 30 is often claimed to be a copy of FY_3 ,⁵⁰ but it is not. As the text given in App. I reveals, the first four lines of FY_5 agree verbatim with FY_3 (hence, also with FY_4), but the next three lines do not. Since these opening lines, in effect, constitute the enunciation of prop. 1, while the lines following initiate the proof, it is clear that FY_5 is an entirely different paraphrase version of the tract, albeit textually related to FY_3 . Unfortunately, too little of it remains to determine more precisely what that relation is. FY_5 resembles FY_3 in the direct and efficient manner of its initial construction, unlike the

⁴⁹ In the lemma after prop. 1, Regiomontanus writes the lines 'facto super E centro . . . sit in P, tunc sic' in the upper margin, in place of lines copied at the wrong place and then scored through: '[8] sicut AC ad FC ita triangulum AEC ad triangulum FEC, [10] et que est sectoris OEP ad sectorem FEP ea est anguli AEC ad angulum FEC, sed' (cf. Clagett, *AMA* 5.578). Comparison with the corresponding steps [8] and [10] later in the proof (see App. IV) reveals that the deleted lines reverse their order, modify the wording and lack an intermediate step. The discrepancy betrays that Regiomontanus is introducing changes as he copies.

⁵⁰ Their identity is claimed by A. A. Björnbo, 'Die mathematischen S. Marcohandschriften in Florenz' (I), *Bibliotheca mathematica* 4₃ (1903-1904) 243; Clagett, *AMA* 3.349; E. Grant, 'Jordanus de Nemore' in *DSB* 7.178; and R. B. Thomson, 'Jordanus de Nemore: Opera', *Mediaeval Studies* 38 (1976) 126. The slip appears to derive from a misstatement by M. Curtze in an 1899 article (cited by both Grant and Thomson) that reproduces only the enunciations. By contrast, Busard includes FY_5 along with FY_3 among the variant forms in his 'second tradition', but does not equate them ('Traktat', 65).

rambling start of FY₄. On the other hand, FY₅ marks the lines of its proof by the terms 'probatio' (twice) and 'item', just as FY₄ does here. If the latter agreement can be viewed as significant, FY₅ would be an intermediary between FY₃ and FY₄.

The other fragment, FY₆, comes from the same manuscript as FY₂ and FY₄, namely, Florence J. V. 18, this fragment occurring as an attachment to prop. 7 in a copy of FY (Busard's 'F').⁵¹ It consists only of the statement and proof of prop. 1. The enunciation and the opening line, providing a definition of 'isoperimeter', agree verbatim (but for scribal errors) with FY₃, save that the definition is here placed after, rather than before, the enunciation. In the paraphrasing manner that has now become familiar to us, the editor of FY₆ follows the basic tenor of FY₃, but seems to cover his tracks by avoiding verbatim agreements with the source. In this instance, the amplifying tendency is pronounced, much as in FY₄, and the marker terms 'probatio' and 'item' are reminiscent of FY₄ and FY₅. Unlike other versions, FY₆ embeds the accompanying lemma within the proof of the main proposition; here the model of FY₃ is followed, but with occasional gratuitous changes (see App. iv), most notably the inversion of the initial ratios and the postponement of composition [6] until after the statement of the proportionalities in [10] and [8].

Within the family of adaptations of the isoperimetric tract, FY₃ occupies a position of prominence. Based directly on the primary translation FY, it has spawned two complete paraphrases, FY₄ and FY₅ (the latter extant only as a fragment), and another partial one, FY₆. By so suggesting that the editor of FY₃ was himself prominent within a circle of mathematical scholars, this pattern provides us an initial clue for identifying him.

V

The Vienna manuscript of FY₃ names 'Jordanus' as author, that is, Jordanus de Nemore, who was responsible for important treatises in mathematics and statics in the thirteenth century.⁵² This attribution has been doubted by Busard and Clagett, for reasons that will be considered below, and Clagett has recommended calling this text instead the 'Version of Regiomontanus', thus isolating it as a fifteenth-century adaptation.⁵³ His position conflicts, however, with the support the

⁵¹ Cf. note 48 above. According to Busard ('Traktat', p. 62 note 8), the same fragment appears also at the analogous place in Madrid, Biblioteca Nacional 10053 (s. xiii), fol. 41rb-va, but he does not transcribe it. I have examined only the Florentine copy.

⁵² Among several good recent accounts of Jordanus' work, one may consult E. Grant, 'Jordanus de Nemore' in *DSB* 7.171-79; R. B. Thomson, *Jordanus de Nemore and the Mathematics of Astrolabes: 'De plana spera'* (Studies and Texts 39; Toronto, 1978), pp. 1-17; M. Clagett, *AMA* 5.145-51. Thomson has also compiled a definitive bibliography of primary and secondary materials on Jordanus in 'Jordanus: *Opera*', 97-144.

⁵³ *AMA* 5.147.

text receives from the two versions we have seen to be derived from it, FY₄ and FY₅, both dating from the fourteenth century; indeed, it receives similar support from FY₆, one copy of which is extant in the thirteenth-century Madrid, Biblioteca Nacional 10053.⁵⁴ Moreover, as I propose now to argue, this attribution is fully compatible with what we can infer from circumstantial and stylistic considerations relative to recognized works of Jordanus.

(1) In his *Liber Philotegni*, Jordanus twice cites the isoperimetric work explicitly, as 'liber ysoperimetrorum' (prop. 5) and 'sicut in isoperimetris' (prop. 39).⁵⁵ In both cases the citation is to the lemma after prop. 1, but neither passage has excerpts from the source long enough to betray which version of the tract has been consulted.⁵⁶ Further, Jordanus includes propositions on isoperimetric triangles and quadrilaterals (props. 61 and 62), and regular polygons (63), the former covering special cases of prop. 5 of *De ysoperimetris*, and the latter being equivalent to its prop. 1, with an alternative proof.⁵⁷ Moreover, he elaborates a series of propositions on the sizes of regular polygons inscribed in or circumscribed about equal circles (prop. 45-50), which propositions form a complement to the subject of isoperimetric polygons in *De ysoperimetris* prop. 1-5. Jordanus' commitment to the study of isoperimetric figures is thus evident, and we must at the least infer his full familiarity with some form of the tract *De ysoperimetris*.

(2) We have seen that FY₃ explicitly cites *De curvis superficiebus* three times in its last proposition. Similarly, Jordanus cites this work, 'ut est in libro de curvis superficiebus', in prop. 29 of *Liber Philotegni*. Indeed, Jordanus' *Liber Philotegni* manifests overall, in the judgment of Clagett, an 'Archimedean flavor', likely to have derived from *De curvis*.⁵⁸ This dependence is also reflected in the presence of editorial phrases which Jordanus must have picked up from *De curvis* — e.g., 'falsigraphus' (in prop. 9, 18), 'diligenter intuenti' (prop. 18), 'sic constat prima pars' (prop. 29; cf. props. 37, 39), 'si meminere priorum' (prop. 36); while *De curvis* could well have inspired Jordanus' remarks 'si quis subtiliter ad memoriam revocet prius hic concessa' (prop. 23) and 'quod constabit facile cogitando' (prop. 63), as well as his pervasive use of 'constat' and 'patet'.⁵⁹

(3) The above passages do not provide any clear signs of *textual* borrowing by *Liber Philotegni* from FY₃, or indeed from any particular form of the isoperimetric

⁵⁴ On the dating of the two Florence manuscripts, see Clagett, *AMA* 1.xxi, xxv, where he cites Björnbo's bibliographical descriptions ('Die mathematischen S. Marcohandschriften in Florenz' (I), 241-45, and (II), *Bibliotheca mathematica* 12, (1911-12) 218-22. I take the date of the Madrid codex from Busard's statement ('Traktat', 62).

⁵⁵ See Clagett's edition in *AMA* 5.200, 226. Clagett also remarks on Jordanus' use of *De ysoperimetris* (*AMA* 5.149-50).

⁵⁶ *AMA* 5.155-56, 577-80.

⁵⁷ For analysis and comparisons, see *AMA* 5.182-84.

⁵⁸ *AMA* 5.150.

⁵⁹ See the stylistic items listed in section 1.

tract.⁶⁰ But there may possibly be a specific reminiscence of FY₃ in the opening lines of prop. 63. The enunciation is reminiscent of the wording of prop. 1 in FY, with which we have seen all versions to be in general agreement:

L. Phil. Si due figure equilatera et equiangle eodem ambitu terminentur, que plurimum fuerit laterum maior erit.⁶¹

FY ... ysoperimetrorum ysopleurorum rectilineorum et circulis contentorum quod plurimum est angulorum maius est. (ed. Busard, lines 2-4)

But the initial lines of the proof seem in specific agreement, if quite loosely, with those of FY₃ and FY₅:

L. Phil. Exempli gratia: sit quadratus A et pentagonus eiusdem circumscriptionis. Dico pentagonum maiorem esse.

FY₃ Sint in duobus circulis pentagonus et exagonus ysopleura et ysoperimetra (1.7-8); FY₅ Probatio, quod sexagonum illud sit maius pentagono (1.7).

From the parallels in the other isoperimetric versions (transcribed in App. 1), one can see that this appears to be the closest link to *Liber Philotegni* among them.

(4) On the other hand, finding stylistic support as evidence of Jordanus' responsibility for FY₃ proves tricky, for Jordanus' style is not easily described in terms of characteristic and unusual editorial expressions.⁶² But this in itself is significant: the austerity of Jordanus' writing, in strict conformity with the classical formal precedent, has been noted by editors and critics of Jordanus' work.⁶³ It is

⁶⁰ Clagett too refrains from making a judgment on affiliation; cf. *AMA* 5.577-80.

⁶¹ *AMA* 5.257

⁶² In the *De numeris datis*, for instance, one encounters a format, evident in practically every proposition, where 'verbi gratia' is invariant as the opening of the proof, and 'quare' and 'palam' are frequent. (The text has been edited with translation and commentary by B. B. Hughes, *The De numeris datis of Jordanus de Nemore* [Diss. Stanford, 1970]). But Jordanus' geometric writings do not subscribe to this format: in *Liber Philotegni*, for instance, although 'quare' is common (but hardly to the extent as in *De numeris datis*), 'palam' is not particularly so (once each in props. 56-57, 61-62); moreover, the openings of proofs are usually not marked, but when they are 'ut' is used once (prop. 19), 'verbi gratia' twice (prop. 50, 60) and 'exempli gratia' once (prop. 63). Similarly, in *De plana spera* 'quare' is reasonably common, but 'palam' is sparse (lines 121, 165), and 'verbi gratia' is absent (cf. the edition of 'version 1' by Thomson, in *Jordanus: De plana spera*). Again, in the *Elementa de ponderibus* 'quare' appears only twice (lines 212, 223), 'palam' also twice (lines 133, 222), but 'verbi gratia' not at all (cf. the edition by E. A. Moody in Moody and Clagett, *The Medieval Science of Weights (Scientia de ponderibus). Treatises ascribed to Euclid, Archimedes, Thabit ibn Qurra, Jordanus de Nemore and Blasius of Parma* [Madison, 1952]). Sharing this pattern of the absence of 'verbi gratia' and 'palam' and the moderate use of 'quare', FY₃, if indeed by Jordanus, would be linked with his geometric writings, in distinction to *De numeris datis*.

⁶³ The stylistic austerity of Jordanus — what Thomson calls their consistently 'Archimedean or Euclidean format' — is an important distinction between the primary 'version 1' of *De plana spera* and the adapted 'version 2' (*Jordanus: De plana spera*, pp. 3-4, 76, 78). J. Høyrup has recently argued that Jordanus' emphasis on 'demonstratio' was intended as the heart of a program to legitimize the mathematical quadrivium within the medieval university curriculum, and that this very

precisely such a formal style that we meet in FY_3 , and to a lesser extent in those versions based directly on it (e.g. FY_4), in contrast with other versions like FY_1 . Indeed, FY_3 is streamlined even by comparison to its immediate source, the Greek-based translation FY .

(5) If we consider another aspect of the notion of editorial style — the basic conception of the editor's role in the treatment of the text — then this affinity is strengthened. Throughout his work⁶⁴ Jordanus adheres closely to the technical subject matter and is disinclined to insert editorial phrases, whether short or long. This editorial sparseness is clear in 'version 1' of *De plana spera*, for instance, in contrast with the alternative 'version 2' (designations by Thomson); it is clear also in *De numeris datis*, and even in *Liber Philotegni*, once one sets off the handful of its lines that seem to imitate *De curvis*.

In this regard, Jordanus' treatment of compound proportions in *De proportionibus* is a particularly good specimen. Comparison with the Latin translation of Thābit's writing on the so-called 'sector figure' reveals that Jordanus has intervened only minimally, merely clarifying some definitions and setting out some preliminary lemmas, but otherwise adhering strictly to the order in the source — that is, setting out each of the eighteen cases of the principal theorem in the same order — while abbreviating the proofs.⁶⁵ The same editorial pattern is manifest in FY_3 : an explicit definition of 'isoperimeters' is given (absent from the source FY), but the order of proof is followed carefully, save for clarifying or streamlining as the situation recommends.

This minimalizing tendency, which sets FY_3 apart from FY_1 , is evident also in the sparseness of its references. Clagett has noted this feature of *Liber Philotegni*: Jordanus explicitly cites only *Liber isoperimetrorum* (twice), *De curvis superficiebus* (once), and Aḥmad ibn Yūsuf's *De similibus arcubus* (three times), as well as Euclid's *Elements* (seven times), in its 63 propositions.⁶⁶ This sparse pattern of citation is evident in Jordanus' other works as well.⁶⁷ FY_3 subscribes to the same

emphasis of formalism set it apart (indeed, doomed it to failure) in that context ('Jordanus de Nemore, 13th Century Mathematical Innovator', *Archive for History of Exact Sciences* 38 [1988] 307-363, especially pp. 339-43).

⁶⁴ To those works mentioned in note 62 I add the *De ratione ponderis* (edited by Moody in Moody and Clagett, *Medieval Science of Weights*), and the *De proportionibus* (edited by H. L. L. Busard in 'Die Traktate *De proportionibus* von Jordanus Nemorarius und Campanus', *Centaurus* 15 [1971] 193-227). I have not yet surveyed Jordanus' arithmetic writings in this connection.

⁶⁵ I have inspected a copy in the Paris, Bibliothèque Mazarine 3642.10, fols. 10v-12r, in comparison with the edition of Jordanus' version by Busard (see preceding note). On the Latin versions of Thābit's work, see the editions by Björnbo (1924) and F. J. Carmody (1960), cited by Sezgin, *Geschichte* 5.268.

⁶⁶ Cf. *AMA* 5.148-50. There are three additional references to *Elements* I 4 in a marginal note to prop. 62; but Clagett sets this note aside as an interpolation (*AMA* 5.149, 257, 292-93).

⁶⁷ In his *Elementa de ponderibus*, Jordanus cites only his own *Liber Philotegni* (twice) and his *Preexercitamina* (not extant). Citations are absent from *De plana spera* ('version 1') and *De numeris*

pattern: it cites *De curvis superficiebus* three times in its last proposition, where its source FY merely cites Archimedes; and its Euclid citation ‘per primam sexti’ in the lemma to prop. 1 may be influenced by FY₁’s citation ‘per ultimam vi^{ti} Euclidis’ for an adjacent step of the same lemma, if we are right in seeing some textual connection between the two versions of the lemma. Elsewhere, FY₃ is striking for its omission of the pertinent Euclidean references, even where the opportunities are clear, as we see from the example of FY₁ (props. 1, 3b, and 7). It is evident, then, that the sparseness of references is a matter of choice with the editor of FY₃.

There is only one exception to this pattern: in the same lemma to prop. 1 FY₃ inserts three additional citations to Euclid: ‘per primam partem 8^{ve} 5^{ti}’, ‘per secundam partem 8^{ve} 5^{ti}’, and ‘per 28^{vam} 5^{ti}’, where in all three cases FY₁ is silent. Assuming Jordanus’ responsibility for FY₃, we would infer that these citations are interpolations (for instance, made by Regiomontanus into his copy), for they conflict not only with Jordanus’ manner in other writings, but also with the rest of FY₃. We observe, further, that FY₄ — based on some form of prototype of the extant FY₃ — cites ‘per primam 6^{ti}’ and ‘per vi librum’, parallel to one of the citations in the Vienna copy of FY₃, and ‘per v^{um} librum’ parallel to its citation of V 8.⁶⁸ It would appear, then, that the prototype of FY₃ offered only a partial precedent for these citations: we can conceive that it held one of the citations to Book vi, and that it may also have cited V 8. But at least one of the citations, to V 28, appears not to have occurred in the original form of FY₃.

By raising suspicion about the secondary character of these passages, specifically about the single phrase ‘per 28^{vam} 5^{ti}’, we remove the one item that has been presumed to rule out Jordanus’ authorship of FY₃. For Busard has observed that the proposition V 28 cited here is present as a supplement made by Campanus to his edition of the *Elements*, but appears in no prior edition. Since Campanus produced his version only around 1260, and Jordanus’ work appeared well before 1250, Busard doubts that Jordanus could have written FY₃; Clagett accepts the inference, as confirming earlier doubts of his own.⁶⁹

As a rule, Euclid citations of this sort are an especially volatile feature of any medieval mathematical text, being particularly vulnerable to editorial addition or modification. Accordingly, they can never of themselves be sufficient reason for deciding questions of authorship. To be sure, patterns of referencing can sometimes provide secondary support, when other considerations of style or circum-

datis. In the latter case, the absence of citations has complicated determining Jordanus’ sources (cf. Hughes, *De numeris datis*, pp. 53–68).

⁶⁸ Similarly, the text of the lemma in FY₆ (also related to FY₃) cites ‘per primum [!] 6^{um}’ and ‘per ultimam 8T [!] 6^{um}?’ and ‘per 8T [!] 8?’ 5^{um}’ at the analogous places (see texts in App. iv). My emendations are based on context. By his ‘8T’ (or ‘GT’), perhaps for ‘8t(i)’, the scribe may intend ‘8v(i)’, that is, a short form for ‘octavi’.

⁶⁹ Busard, ‘Traktat’, 65; Clagett, *AMA* 5.147.

tance are clear (as has been done in sections II-III, for instance). But the balance of FY₃, apart from this single passage, yields no support at all for the hypothesis that it is not authentic.

We encounter in other writings of Jordanus a similar phenomenon of interpolated citations of Euclid. In the *Liber de triangulis*, a reediting of Jordanus' *Liber Philotegni*, as well as in 'version 2' of his *De plana spera*, Jordanus' original text, sparsely annotated, has attracted interpolations in the form of numerous explicit citations of the *Elements*.

In the matter of Jordanus' authorship of FY₃, then, the principal (indeed, the sole) cause of doubt has been removed. Otherwise, from *Liber Philotegni* we have unquestionable testimony to Jordanus' interest in isoperimetry, such that his responsibility for such a paraphrase edition of *De ysoperimetris* becomes highly plausible. Furthermore, although one cannot identify characteristic editorial expressions that might link FY₃ to other Jordanian writings, it is clear that FY₃ adheres to the same austere formal style that marks all of Jordanus' work.

In my view, the issue ultimately reduces to the credibility of the witness of Regiomontanus. Clagett has surmised that, at the least, a heading attributing FY₃ to Jordanus was present in the exemplar Regiomontanus copied from.⁷⁰ Busard, to the contrary, conjectures that the heading might be due to Regiomontanus himself, misled by the appearance of Jordanus' *De plana spera* immediately before FY₃ in the same Vienna codex.⁷¹ By the same token, however, the juxtaposition of the two works could indicate their shared provenance from a legitimate collection of Jordanus' writings. Conversely, if the attribution to Jordanus were arbitrary, being merely a copyist's invention (either by Regiomontanus or his exemplar), it is remarkable that the work in question should have an editorial style consistent with that attribution.

Regiomontanus' copy of *De plana spera* in the same Vienna codex 5203 is witness to what Thomson calls 'version 3' of that work. This version differs from the primary tradition only to a limited extent. For long stretches it agrees with 'version 1' practically verbatim, except for minor scribal changes, substitution of equivalent phrases, and the like, although Regiomontanus does not alter the formal tone of his source. But occasionally there are larger interventions: the amplification of a section of a proof (cf. prop. 1, lines 30-40), for instance, or the insertion of Euclid citations (in prop. 1 only) or of comments on practical applications (as for the construction of astrolabes).⁷²

According to Thomson's description of the manuscripts, 'version 3' is found in only three copies besides the Vienna copy by Regiomontanus, all four from the

⁷⁰ *AMA* 3.349.

⁷¹ 'Traktat', 65.

⁷² Thomson, *Jordanus: De plana spera*, p. 78.

fifteenth century, and two printed editions of the sixteenth century, based on the Vienna copy.⁷³ Although Thomson gives priority to the non-Regiomontanus line in his edition, it is not the case that the special readings in Regiomontanus' copy are all inferior to the alternatives.⁷⁴ In view of the extraordinarily minor discrepancies within the entire set of copies, I think it quite feasible to suppose that 'version 3' depends on a prototype that is an edition by Regiomontanus himself. *Prima facie*, this would seem more plausible than the alternative, that Regiomontanus happened merely to transcribe a revision made by an anonymous editor only slightly earlier.

Accordingly, I would take FY₃ to be a comparable adaptation by Regiomontanus of a Jordanian edition of *De isoperimetris*. With this view, the differences between the two forms would be minimal: they might include the Euclid citation (to V 28), impossible in a genuine writing by Jordanus, but they would not affect the basic style or argument of the original.

Florence J. V. 18 transmits no attribution for FY₄, and I perceive no clear stylistic habits linking it to any of the editions of the Euclidean and Archimedean writings extant from the thirteenth century. But it shares certain idiosyncracies found among the annotations to the Jordanian geometrical corpus. Specifically, FY₄ often marks the beginning of its proofs with 'probatio': in prop. 1 and its lemma, twice in prop. 2, again in prop. 4,⁷⁵ in the corollary at the end of prop.

⁷³ *ibid.*, pp. 78-79.

⁷⁴ The principal criterion by which one might subordinate the witness of Regiomontanus to the other copies would be the detection of a clear pattern where variants in the non-Jordanian exemplars (Florence, Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale Conv. soppr. J. X. 40, Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vat. pal. lat. 1389, and Vat. pal. lat. 1212) are supported by 'version 1', but the Vienna exemplar (W) is not. There are some readings of this sort: 'uno' (W) vs. 'quolibet' (alii) in line 2, and other variants in lines 3, 4 and 6 (all relating to the enunciation of prop. 1); 'hic est' (W) vs. 'habetur' (alii) in line 69; the omission of 'poli AB' (W) in line 81; the addition of 'ex hypothesi' (W) in line 85; the omission of 'ubi' (W), line 93; 'itaque' (W) vs. 'cum igitur' (alii), line 107; 'eo quod' (W) vs. 'quia' (alii), line 116; the omission of 'poli' by W, line 133; 'quod' (W) vs. 'quia' (alii), line 145; the omission of 'per' in line 160, of 'cuiuslibet' in line 167, of 'per' in line 170, of 'diameter' in line 184; 'item' (W) vs. 'ergo' (alii), line 194; the addition of 'similiter' by W in line 209; the omission of 'et sit' in line 212; the addition of 'qui est vice circuli' in line 217, and of 'alterius' in line 219.

But some readings in W are supported by 'version 1': 'erit' in line 36, 'aequidistantibus' in line 46, 'ita' in line 57, the presence of 'ei quod continetur sub FP et PO' in line 58, 'cui' (for 'ei' of 'version 1') in line 74, 'sit enim' in line 80, the omission of 'scilicet' in line 87, 'ducta' in line 106, 'pro declinatione' in line 179, the omission of 'arcus' in line 195, 'sit' in line 206, 'noti sunt' in line 209, 'a quo' in line 219. This collation supports the judgment of Thomson that neither W nor the other group of copies can be set in simple subordination, one to the other. On the other hand, the discrepancies between the two sets (which are virtually exhausted by the above list) are remarkably trivial, certainly by comparison to their consensus in disagreement with 'version 1'. It would be consistent with this pattern to view both sets as made from the same exemplar – for instance, a master copy by Regiomontanus.

⁷⁵ Following the alternative text in Vienna 5277, fol. 234r-v, Busard reads 'probo' here ('Traktat', p. 87, line 18).

3b, in prop. 5 and in prop. 6. The same habit is prominent in the set of annotations to *Liber Philotegni* held in Florence J. I. 32 (late thirteenth century), denoted 'Fa' by Clagett: in the comments to prop. 26, lines 18-19; 34.52-53, 35.10-16, 37.14-15 (five times), 45.14-18, 18-19, and 46.19-20 (cf. also those to 1.11 and 18.29).⁷⁶ The phrase 'hoc argumentum sic patet' (FY₄ prop. 3) is in the manner of several in Fa, e.g. 'hoc argumentum patet' in the comments to 20.23-30 and 37.10-12 (cf. also 12.16-18, 19.6, 23.23, 34.39, 35.52-53, 36.9, 37.14-15, 45.14-18). Furthermore, the interpolation of Euclid citations in FY₄ (particularly in prop. 1) is ubiquitous among the annotations in Fa, while citation of *De curvis*, as in FY₄ prop. 7 (see above), is found also in Fa ('ut ostensum est in libro de curvis superficiebus', 34.30-31). In all these respects, both texts FY₄ and Fa depart from the explicit model of their respective sources. Moreover, since the comments in Fa frequently stand in place of the text of Jordanus, the resultant version resembles FY₄ in being a pastiche of the source text and revisions of it.

Where Jordanus cites 'in libro ysoperimetrorum' in *Liber Philotegni* prop. 5, the annotator in Fa amplifies in a comment which runs in part thus:

Dico quod minor est proportio DFC anguli ad CFA angulum quam DC ad CA. Super centrum F describatur circulus secundum quantitatem FC qui secabit DF in E et pertransibit FA que producat ad B. Age ex prima parte octave quinti Euclidis ... Ergo a primo maior est proportio ... Ergo ex prima et ultima quinti [! sexti] Euclidis ... (ed. Clagett, ad 5.11)

This comment recalls several phrases from the lemma attached to prop. 1 in FY₃ and FY₄ (for full texts, see Appendix IV):

Quia vero maior sit proportio AC ad FC quam anguli AEC ad angulum FEC sic patet. Nam facto super E centro circulo secundum quantitatem semidiametri EF circulus secabit AE, sit in O, et secabit EC continuatam, sit in P ... per primam partem 8^{ve} 5^{ti} ... per primam sexti ... (FY₃)

Probatio eius quod restat probandum, quod maior sit proportio I ad F quam anguli oppositi I ad angulum oppositum F. Describatur circulus secundum quantitatem C lineae ... per primam 6^{ti} ... per vi librum ... per v^{um} librum ... Ergo a primo maior est proportio ... (FY₄)

Overall, the annotator of Fa appears to draw from the model of FY₃, even to the extent of imitating its lettering. According to the present hypothesis, the correspondences with FY₄ would derive from the same editor's having produced FY₄ later.

⁷⁶ The citations are to the apparatus in Clagett's edition, *AMA* 5; on the codex, see *AMA* 5.194. Note that where the cited comment corresponds to a passage of several lines, it usually is a replacement for those lines, rather than an addition to them.

The link between FY_4 and Fa receives additional support from the *Liber de triangulis*, an expanded edition of *Liber Philotegni* with completely reworked proofs.⁷⁷ Like its source, some copies of the longer work have been annotated and even modified. Indeed, in two of the copies (Dresden, Sächsische Landesbibliothek Db 86 and Florence J. V. 18, fols. 17r-29v) many of the annotations we have already noted in *Liber Philotegni* (Fa) have been appended to or substituted for the corresponding parts of *Liber de triangulis*.⁷⁸ Several of the most substantial of these coinciding passages are notable for the stylistic features mentioned above: the frequent use of 'probatio' and 'argumentum', and the citation of *De curvis*.⁷⁹ Since Florence J. V. 18 holds FY_4 (fols. 11r-12v) only a few pages before *Liber de triangulis* (fols. 17r-29v), it is reasonable to infer that the corresponding source texts – Fa (for *Liber Philotegni*) and the exemplar of FY_4 – are also textually related, as we argue before on stylistic grounds.

The evidence is such that one might feel more comfortable with a weaker hypothesis: that the parallels reflect a 'school style' characteristic of the scholars committed to the study of Jordanus' work. But I observe that the features typifying the annotations in Fa (*Liber Philotegni*) and the two copies of *De triangulis* are

⁷⁷ Clagett's critical text is included in *AMA* 5. Against the older view, Clagett maintains that *Liber de triangulis* is not by Jordanus, but by some unknown editor possibly active before Campanus (*AMA* 5.297-301). In addition to Clagett's arguments, one can add that the editorial styles of *Liber Philotegni* and *Liber de triangulis* are so different that the works could not plausibly be assigned to the same author. Høyrup has noted this stylistic discrepancy, and proposes that *De triangulis* might be a 'reportatio' made by a disciple from the lectures of Jordanus ('Jordanus de Nemore', 348-51). But I am struck by the stylistic similarities linking *De triangulis* to 'Adelard II', and intend to develop this idea in the sequel on the Euclidean versions.

⁷⁸ The Dresden copy (s. xiv in.) and the Florence copy (s. xiv) are closely related in both text and annotations; see Clagett, *AMA* 5.340, 342. Among the annotations, that to Book III, prop. 9, lines 39-49 is in verbatim agreement with *L. Phil.* 34, lines 30-44 and includes the citation added in Fa ('ut ostensum est in libro de curvis superficiebus'); the long note replacing III.12.21-26 reproduces the corresponding text of Fa, that is, *L. Phil.* 37.12-14 together with most of the annotation replacing its lines 14-15; in place of the proof of IV.9 there appears an alternative text based on the annotations in Fa to *L. Phil.* 45.14-18 and 18-19.

⁷⁹ In noting coincident passages of the sort mentioned in the preceding note, Clagett presumes that the scribe of Fa (*L. Philotegni*) has been influenced by *De triangulis* (cf. *AMA* 5.189-90). But I think the dependence is more likely in the opposite direction: first, the annotations in Fa are more extensive than those in the Dresden (D) and Florence (Fb) copies of *De triangulis*, while consistency of style argues assigning them to a single annotator. Second, the Florence copy (Fa) of *L. Philotegni* holds only 46 of the 63 propositions of that work, to which are added three from *De triangulis* (IV.12, 13, 10); the annotator of Fa gives no evidence of knowledge of the remaining portion of *De triangulis* (IV.14-28), and conversely, this section of *De triangulis* (D and Fb) all but entirely lacks annotations stylistically related to those in Fa (a possible exception occurs in a note to IV.18.3-10). I would thus propose that Fa represents a pivotal stage in the editing of these works: that a short form of *L. Philotegni*, in 46 propositions, having undergone partial revision and extensive annotation, resulted in the version Fa, which, when adapted and then combined with an appendix of miscellaneous geometric problems (e.g. IV.14-28), became *De triangulis*. On the present view, the editor responsible for this intermediate step, Fa, also produced FY_4 .

not apparent in other copies of these works (e.g., in the heavily annotated Basel manuscript of *Liber Philotegni*). I thus incline to the stronger view, that the same editor is at work both in FY₄ and the Jordanian editions stylistically associated with it.

As for FY₅, since it is only a fragment, any statement about its authorship is merely conjectural. Nevertheless, setting it as a bridge between FY₃ and FY₄ seems reasonable (as the appearance of 'probatio' suggests), whence it too would be assigned to a disciple in Jordanus' circle. The contents of Florence J. V. 30 where FY₅ appears (fol. 12v) suggest associations with Jordanus:⁸⁰ his *Elementa de ponderibus* is here (fols. 7r-8r), as well as works attributed to him, the *De proportionibus* (fols. 8r-9v), the *Astrolabium demonstratum* (fols. 52v-53v),⁸¹ and the *De speculis* (fols. 4v-7r),⁸² and so also is Aḥmad b. Yūsuf's *De arcubus similibus*, which, as mentioned above, Jordanus cites in *Liber Philotegni* (prop. 29, 32, 36). The presence of *De curvis superficiebus* (fols. 1r-4v) and the Florence Version of *De quadratura circuli* (fols. 9v-12v) might lead us to expect a connection with John of Tynemouth. But as Jordanus knows *De curvis* too, it is appropriate that these works would be in a compilation by Jordanus' disciples. Alternatively, it may be that the disciple groups of John and Jordanus overlapped (see below).

A network of textual relations thus emerges: the editor of FY₄ appears to be responsible for the annotations to Jordanus' *Liber Philotegni* (in copy Fa), some of which recur among the notes to *Liber de triangulis*; at the same time, FY₄ is based principally on FY₃, a text we have argued to be by Jordanus. This implied Jordanian association for the editor of FY₄ in its turn lends confirmation to our earlier argument in support of the Jordanian attribution of FY₃. Although I can make no specific proposal on the identity of the editor of FY₄, he manifests a special commitment to the work of Jordanus, of the sort we would presume of a close associate or disciple.

VI

In summary, I argue that the versions of *De figuris ysoperimetris* are related to each other thus:

⁸⁰ Cf. Björnbo, 'S. Marcohandschriften in Florenz (I)', 241-45.

⁸¹ Cf. Thomson, *Jordanus: De plana spera*, pp. 186-87; Thomson treats its Jordanian ascription, explicit in only one of the nine extant manuscripts, as dubious (see also his 'Jordanus: *Opera*', 126-27).

⁸² This is a paraphrase version, based on a literal rendition of the pseudo-Euclidean *Catoptrica*, in the manner of the twelfth-century Sicilian group. The paraphrase version survives in several other manuscripts, one of which attributes it to Jordanus (Digby 174, fol. 179r). Although Thomson considers the attribution 'weak' ('Jordanus: *Opera*', p. 129), I view it as defensible and intend a separate discussion of the issue.

The principal version (FY) is a literal translation made directly from the Greek. Its close word-for-word rendition is characteristic of other Greco-Latin translations produced at Sicily around the 1160s. Moreover, the Greek prototype underlying FY is extant as an introduction to the very codex of Ptolemy's *Almagest* that was consulted for translation within this same group. It is thus reasonable to associate FY with these others — plausibly, to the very translator who rendered the *Almagest*.

A paraphrase version (FY₁), whose unique extant copy is in the thirteenth-century codex Oxford Digby 174, fols. 178v-179r, is based directly on FY. The distinctive style of its editing is recognizable in two other works: the tract *De curvis superficiebus* (extant in a dozen manuscripts) and the so-called 'Florence Version' of *De quadratura circuli* (principal extant version in the thirteenth-century codex Florence J. V. 30, fols. 9v-12v). The codices lend corroboration, for the same Oxford codex also holds *De curvis* (fols. 174v-178r), immediately ahead of FY₁, as well as a form of *De quadratura* (fols. 133v-134v, but in the version of Gerard of Cremona, the direct prototype on which the 'Florence Version' is based). Similarly, the Florence codex holds *De curvis* (fols. 1r-4v), but only a fragment of an alternative form of the isoperimetric tract (FY₅).

A second adaptation (FY₂), whose unique extant copy is in the fourteenth-century codex Florence J. V. 18, fols. 96v-97v, is based on FY₁. Its style is in the manner of paraphrase editions of two other works: the so-called 'Cambridge Version' of *De quadratura circuli* (principal copy in Gonville and Caius 504 (271) (s. xiii), fols. 108v-109v; second copy in Florence J. V. 18 (s. xiv), fol. 92r-v), and a revised version of *De curvis superficiebus* (unique known copy, also in Florence J. V. 18, fols. 92v-96v). The juxtaposition of all three versions, *De quadratura*, *De curvis*, and *De ysoperimetris*, in consecutive sequence in the same Florence manuscript, J. V. 18, corroborates our finding of a common editor. Moreover, each of the three versions by this second editor is based on the corresponding version by the first editor, mentioned above. Not only does this lend further support to the finding that each of the trilogies has a single editor, but it suggests a link between the editors themselves, e.g. of master to disciple.

A third adaptation (FY₃) exists complete only in the codex Vienna 5203 (s. xv), fols. 142r-146r, copied out by Regiomontanus. Like FY₁, it is based directly on FY, although in one section, its treatment of the lemma after prop. 1, it appears to be in structural conformity with FY₁. The Vienna copy is assigned explicitly to 'Jordanus', and comparisons of its content and style with the recognized geometric writings of Jordanus de Nemore raise no questions against that attribution. The fact that Jordanus' *De plana spera* is held immediately before FY₃ in this Vienna codex can be viewed as supporting the association.

A fourth adaptation (FY₄), whose unique copy is in Florence J. V. 18 (s. xiv), fols. 11r-12v, is an adaptation of FY₃. Doubtless through scribal error, however,

its last proposition is a verbatim transcript of FY. Overall, the performance of the Florence scribe is deplorable, both for FY₄ and for FY₂ and the items associated with it, all in his hand. Thus this copy provides a *terminus ante quem*, rather than an actual fourteenth-century date for their composition. The editorial style of this version resembles that of the annotator of Jordanus' *Liber Philotegni*, as held in Florence J. I. 32, late thirteenth century, fols. 124r-135v; similar annotations appear in some of the copies of the revised edition of this work, the *De triangulis*, e.g. in Florence J. V. 18, fols. 17r-29v.

The dependence of FY₄ on FY₃ undermines any effort to assign responsibility to Regiomontanus himself for FY₃, since it entails that the text form of FY₃ was already available at least a century before his time. But Regiomontanus certainly introduced minor scribal and editorial variants into his transcript, so that we must treat FY₃ as a partially modified form. The case with Jordanus' *De plana spera* seems comparable: that 'version 1' exists in a slightly adapted form as 'version 3' in Regiomontanus' hand.

Only the first seven lines are extant of another version (FY₅) in the fourteenth-century codex Florence J. V. 30, fol. 12v (immediately following its copy of the 'Florence Version' of *De quadratura circuli*). This agrees precisely with FY₃ in its first four lines, but diverges from it in the next three, whence we infer it to be another paraphrase version, within the line of FY₃. Although too little survives for us to be confident of its precise position, it shares with FY₄ the use of 'probatio' as the term initiating its proof, and so may possibly be a bridge between FY₃ and FY₄.

A partial adaptation (FY₆), consisting only of an alternative proof of prop. 1 and its accompanying lemma, is extant in Florence J. V. 18, fols. 5v-6r. Although it could possibly be a fragment of another complete paraphrase version (for the Florence copy must be secondary), there is nothing to indicate that. Like FY₄ and FY₅, this version agrees precisely with FY₃ on the wording of its opening lines, and it maintains general agreement with FY₃ for the course of its proof. One infers its dependence on FY₃.

The above scheme agrees with Busard in distinguishing FY as a 'first tradition' of *De ysoperimetris*, and in setting FY₁ in direct dependence on FY. But Busard indiscriminately combines the next four versions (FY₂ to FY₅) as a 'second tradition' lacking textual unity. It now appears, however, that FY₁ and FY₃ are descended in parallel from FY, with FY₂ dependent on the first, and the remaining variants (FY₄, FY₅ and FY₆) forming a group dependent on the second.

Two additional fragments may be noted: (1) The alternative proof of prop. 4 which has displaced the corresponding portion of the copy of FY held in Vienna 5277, fol. 234r-v (copied in 1525) is in verbatim agreement (but for scribal discrepancies) with prop. 4 of FY₄. Somehow, then, the scribe of this Vienna codex had access to the prototype of FY₄, or to a good copy made from it. (2)

The alternative proofs of prop. 5-6 which occur in place of the corresponding parts of FY in two copies (Madrid 10053, fols. 40v-41r, and Florence J. V. 18, fol. 5r-v) are difficult to place.⁸³ A link with FY₁ is suggested by the appearance in prop. 5 of the phrase 'si dicet falsigrafus', as well as by the qualifier 'anguli non propinqui', reminiscent of 'anguli oppositi' in FY₁. Otherwise, I see no clear link with any other particular variant form of prop. 5. For prop. 6, however, this variant is hardly more than a lightly edited version of FY; in particular, at the end of its proof it transcribes verbatim from portions of the proof in FY.

I would suppose that the motive for substituting alternative proofs, as in the two preceding fragments (as also in the substitution in FY₄ of FY's form of prop. 7), results from the scribe's finding unusable the exemplar from which he is copying. In consulting a supplementary source, he would of course not care whether it represented the same tradition of the text or not.

The identity of the primary translator of FY is unknown but for the association with the Sicilian court in the 1160s. Of our paraphrasing editors, two are known: FY₁ is due to John of Tynemouth, composer of *De curvis superficiebus*; FY₃ is assignable to Jordanus de Nemore, as Regiomontanus' copy avers. The editor of FY₂ can be described as an associate of John. Similarly, the editor of FY₄ appears to have some affiliation with Jordanus, particularly since he can also be associated with the annotation and revision of Jordanus' *Liber Philotegni*.

Basic details of the lives of John and Jordanus have yet to be settled. Most of their works were already in circulation before 1250, while attestations to some of them have been discerned several decades earlier than that. The present findings indicate that Jordanus knew John's *De curvis* and *De ysoperimetris*, and so must be placed sometime after him. I cannot pursue this matter further here, since settling the issue of John's chronology depends on additional documentation, specifically, the Euclid recension called 'Adelard III' and a variety of citations in thirteenth-century sources. These have been incorporated into a separate essay.⁸⁴ From that inquiry, however, it emerges that both were active about a half century later than most estimates usually suppose, that is, not in the latter part of the twelfth century, but more likely around the 1220s and 1230s, Jordanus' work commencing before this period, and John's continuing beyond it.⁸⁵

The paraphrase versions of our survey can be viewed as the output, then, of two masters and their disciples. Since there is some evidence in the texts on each side of a certain awareness of those on the other, I would surmise that the two disciple

⁸³ Busard gives the text in 'Traktat', 85-87.

⁸⁴ See my 'John of Tynemouth *alias* John of London', to appear in *The British Journal for the History of Science* (1990).

⁸⁵ This result has implications for the issue of Jordanus' identity, as I intend to discuss separately in a companion piece to that cited in the preceding note.

groups included some members in common. Jordanus' work is extensively cited in Richard de Fournival's *Biblionomia*, so that his activity most likely centered on Paris.⁸⁶ Similarly, John's *De curvis* is cited by Robert Grosseteste ca. 1230,⁸⁷ so that his center, at least initially, was likely to be Oxford. The paraphrase versions FY₁ and FY₃ seem well described as master's adaptations, intended to supplant FY as the basic text for their students; the other versions could well be exercises by advanced students to demonstrate their proficiency in this material. This notion of the purpose of these adaptations would account for the absence of any new technical insights in them, for their close adherence to the structural precedent of their sources, and also for their zeal to modify wording, to the point of removing almost all overt linguistic reminders of the source.

The fact that Florence J. V. 18 contains elements of five different versions in whole or part (FY, FY₂, FY₄, FY₆, and the alternative proofs of prop. 5-6) is striking. In light of the above, I think this codex could be the copy of a collection of writings in the Jordanian circle, that is, a repository of its study texts and exercises.

The principal conclusion proposed in the present essay, that some of the paraphrase editions of *De ysoperimetris* and related works might be due to the same editors, can hardly be considered remarkable. Indeed, it is what we would expect. What is remarkable, I think, is that stylistic clues in specific texts — that is, designated versions of *De quadratura circuli*, *De curvis superficiebus* and *De figuris ysoperimetris* — enable one actually to detect which particular editions are assignable to which editors. One can anticipate that further examination of the various adaptations, including those of the *Elements* and other works, will distinguish a relatively small number of responsible editors, and so clarify significantly our picture of the formal geometric curriculum in the thirteenth century.

APPENDIX

I present here specimens from the five principal versions of *De figuris ysoperimetris*. In section I appear the enunciation and opening lines of prop. 1, in section II the text of prop. 6, in section III excerpts from prop. 7, and in section IV the text of the lemma attached after prop. 1.

For the primary text, FY, the literal version from the Greek, I follow the edition by Busard, 'Der Traktat *De isoperimetris*', *Mediaeval Studies* 42 (1980) 61-88.

The manuscripts for the paraphrase versions are as follows: FY₁, Oxford, Bodleian Library Digby 174, fols. 178v-179r; FY₂, Florence, J. V. 18, fols. 96v-97v; FY₃, Vienna,

⁸⁶ For citations to Fournival's listing, see Clagett, *AMA* 5.146. Jordanus' activity at Paris is a central feature of Høyrup's account ('Jordanus: Innovator', 343-51).

⁸⁷ For the citation in Grosseteste's *Commentary on the Physics*, see Clagett, *AMA* 3.1254.

Österreichische Nationalbibliothek 5203, fols. 142r-146r; FY₄, Florence J. V. 18, fols. 11r-12v; FY₅, the fragment consisting of the opening lines of prop. 1, in Florence J. V. 30, fol. 12v; FY₆, the version of prop. 1 and its lemma appended to the copy of FY in Florence J. V. 18, fols. 5v-6r.

The cited manuscripts hold the unique extant copies for these paraphrase versions, save for a fragment: prop. 4 of FY₄ also appears in place of FY prop. 4 in Vienna, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek 5277, fol. 234r-v (see Busard, 'Traktat', 87-88).

In my transcriptions I have adopted modern conventions for capitalization, punctuation and spellings (e.g. 'ti' rather than 'ci'), even where that necessitates minor alterations of the source readings. I have set the enunciations of the propositions in italics instead of employing enlarged letters as the manuscripts do. Words in square brackets are my editorial additions to explain anomalous readings, and numerals in square brackets have been inserted to facilitate comparisons among the versions. Angled brackets indicate words I have supplied where scribal omission is suspected.

FY₁ is extensively abbreviated; I indicate in parentheses what I have supplied in those cases where the abbreviation is in doubt, or where construal might affect the interpretation of the text, or where the term is not standard in Latin palaeography (viz., listed in A. Cappelli, *Dizionario di abbreviature latine*, 6th edition, Milan, 1979). Thus, I write *ratio* (for *rō*), *-que* (for *q:*), *ergo* (for *g°*), *triangulum* (for *tⁱan^u*, or the like), and so on, as being familiar, but in most instances I indicate the abbreviations for *diameter*, *semidiameter*, *isoperimetricum*, and other comparably specialized terms.

The carelessness of the scribe of Florence J. V. 18 creates special problems for the presentation of FY₂, FY₄, and FY₆. I have decided simply to reproduce what he has written, as best I can, with occasional indications in square brackets of the most likely correct reading.

I. The Openings of Prop. 1.

FY [1] *Prelibandum vero primum quoniam ysoperimetricorum ysopleurorum rectilineorum et circulis contentorum quod plurimum est angulorum maius est.* [2] *Adiaceant enim duo rectilinea ysopleura et ysoperimetra AB, GD et sint circulis circumscripta pluresque habeat angulos AB quam GD.* [3] *Dico quoniam maius est AB quam GD* (lines 2-7).

FY₁ [1] *Prelibandum primo quoniam omnium isoperimetricorum ysopleurorum rectilineorum et circulis inscriptibilium superficierum quod plurimum est angulorum maius est.* [1a] *Figura dicitur alii ysoperimetra quando omnia latera unius insimul accepta equalia sunt omnibus lateribus alterius insimul acceptis.* [2] *Proponatur exagonus ABC inscriptus circulo et sit perimetre [! isoperimetre] pentagono DEF circulo inscripto.* [3] *Propositum est ostendere exagonum esse maiorem pentagono* (fol. 178v, lines 1-3).

FY₂ [1a] *ysoperimetra quorum latera sunt equalia, ut vl [! v] linee includentis pentagonum [!] sex lineis includentibus ex* [rest of line blank, for the space of about 32 letters]

[1] *Omnium ysoperimetricorum ysopleurorum circulis contentorum quod plurimum est angulorum maius est.* [2] *Sicut [! Sint] ergo pentagonum et exagonum Y, Z.* [3] *Dico ergo quod exagonus est maior* (fol. 96va, lines 1-9).

FY₃ [1a] *Isoperimetra sunt quorum latera coniunctim sumpta sunt equalia, ut quinque linee includentes pentagonum sex lineis includentibus exagonum sint equales exagonum et pentagonum sunt ysoperimetra.*

[1] *Ysopleurorum et ysoperimetrorum rectilineorum et circulis contentorum, quod plurimum est angularum maius est.* [2] *Sint enim duobus circulis pentagonus et exagonus ysopleura et ysoperimetra.* [2a] *Latus pentagoni sit AB, divisum in duo equalia in O, cuius tamquam corde arcus sit ADB* (fol. 142r, lines 2-11).

FY₄ [1a] *<Iso>perimetra sunt quorum latera coniunctim sunt equalia, ut quinque linee includentis pentagonum vi lineis includentibus exagonum sint equales exagonum et pentagonum sunt ysoperimetra* [1] *ysoplentorum* [word written with underscoring, as if to delete] *et ysoperimetrorum circul(is) contentorum quod plurimum est angularum maius est.*

[2a] *Probatio. Dicatur A vero pentagoni B cor(da) li(ne)a* [?] *arcus A dicatur s. cor(da) circumf(eren)ti(e)* [?] *dicatur D. Item, au(tem)* [?] *pentagoni C arcus eius qui est supra centrum pentagoni dicatur E* (fol. 11ra, lines 1-10).

FY₅ [1a] *Ysoperymetra* [!] *sunt quorum latera coniunctim sunt* [dots below *sunt*, indicating deletion] *sumpta sunt equalia, ut 5 linee includentes pentagonum vi lineis includentibus exagonum sunt equales, exagonum et pentagonum sunt ysoperymetra.*

[1] *Ysoperymetrorum ysopleurorum rectilineorum circulis contentorum quod plurimum est angularum maius est.* [2] *Probatio. Inscribatur pentagonum equilaterum circulo IO. Item inscribatur sexagonum ysopleurum, i.(e.) equilaterum circulo Z, et ita habeant se pentagonum et sexagonum quod omnia latera pariter accepta sunt equalia omnibus lateribus sexagoni simul sumptis, [1b] et sic se habentia dicuntur ysoperymetra.* [3] *Probatio, quod sexagonum illud sit maius pentagono. Sumatur linea in pentagono A scilicet* (fol. 12v, lines 32-38).

FY₆ [1] *(Y)soperimetrorum ysoperimetrorum* [!] *circulis contentorum quod est plurimum et* [!] *angularum maius est.* [1a] *Notandum quod ysoperimetra sunt quorum latera simul sumpta sunt equalia, ut 5 ut* [!] *linee includentes petagonum* [!] *et exagonum dicuntur ysoperimetra* [2] *descripleantur* [!] *describantur* [!] *ita 2 ysoperimetra et ysopleura unde* [!] *unum* [!] *petagonum alterum exagonum et inscribantur* [!] *circulus* [3] *dico exagonum maius est pedagono. Probatio, protrahantur lineae GZ, D3, AE, BE* (fol. 5vb, lines 47-57).

Comments

Of all the paraphrases, FY₁ is closest to FY, but FY₁ inserts at [1a] a definition of isoperimeters, 'figura dicitur...', absent from FY. The term is also defined in FY₃, but with different wording and set at a different position. The other versions also attach the definition, in agreement with FY₃. In addition, FY₅ volunteers a second statement at [1b].

In FY₂ the enunciation [1] and opening of the proof [2-3] can be taken as an abridgment of the corresponding lines of FY₁; but the initial lines [1a] seem to have been placed here through scribal error, for they break off in the middle of a word, 'ex(agonum)'. Since these lines are practically identical in wording and placement to the initial lines of FY₃ (and the three versions after it), the scribe of FY₂ has probably copied them by mistake

from one of these sources — presumably, from his source exemplar for FY_4 , since that version appears in the same codex. It is possible, however, that a certain familiarity with FY_3 has affected the composition of FY_2 from the start.

FY_4 begins in close agreement with the wording of FY_3 and continues as an elaboration of it in the proof; for instance, by casting the construction in terms of the ‘corda’ and ‘arcus’ in [2a] and by omitting [3], FY_4 can find a direct precedent in FY_3 . A similar paraphrastic correspondence is evident through most of this proposition. The opening of the proof here in FY_4 seems to be incoherent, doubtless through scribal errors.

FY_5 agrees literally with the opening of FY_3 , but diverges from it in the following lines of its proof; the appearance of ‘probatio’ and ‘item’ may suggest a link also with FY_4 . The words I set in italics in [3] appear in the lower margin as keywords to the beginning of the next page. As the rest is lost, I can offer no other proposals about textual affiliation.

FY_6 appears to be in the textual line of FY_3 .

II. Proposition 6.

FY [1] *Hoc autem demonstrato demonstrabitur et quod ex principio propositum est propter quod et ista prelibata sunt:* [1a] *quoniam circulus omnium ysoperimetricorum figurarum maximus est.* [2] Quoniam demonstratum est quoniam omnium ysoperimetricorum et eque multorum laterum figurarum maius est quod equilaterum et equiangulum, si demonstretur omni equilatero et equiangulo ysoperimetro circulo maior circulus, manifestum quoniam erit demonstratum quod inquisitum est.

[3] Esto ergo circulus AB, ysoperimetricum vero ipsi polygonium DEZ. [4] Dico quoniam maior circulus est polygonio. [5] Scribatur enim in DEZ polygonio circulus cuius centrum T et copulentur TI, cathetus ergo est super EZ. [6] Esto vero et eius quod est AB centrum quidem G, ex centro vero GB. Quoniam ergo ysoperimeter est circulus DEZ polygonio, perimetros vero eius quod est DEZ maior perimetro ipsius inscripti circuli, maior est et circulus AB circulo ei quod est DEZ inscripto circulo, [7] quare et GB quam TI maior. [8] Et est quidem quod sub TI et perimetro polygonii duplum polygonii, [9] quod vero sub GB et perimetro circuli duplum circuli. [10] Maius ergo duplum duplo, [11] quare et dimidium dimidio. [12] Maior ergo circulus polygonio.

[13] Quoniam vero quod sub ea que ex centro et perimetro circuli duplum circuli demonstratum est Archimenedi in mensuratione circuli. [14] Demonstravit enim quoniam omnis circulus equalis est trigono orthogonio cuius que ex centro equalis est uni earum que circa rectum, reliqua vero perimetro circuli (ed. Busard, lines 222-242).

FY_1 [1] *Hoc autem demonstrato: demonstrabitur quod ex principio propositum est, propter quod et ista prelibata sunt,* [1a] *quoniam circulus omnium isoperimetricorum maximum est.* [2] Quoniam demonstratum est quod omnium isoper(imetricorum) et equimultorum laterum maius est quod est equilaterum et equiangulum, si demonstretur quod omni equilatero et equiangulo isoperi(metro) maior sit circulus, palam demonstratur quod inquisitum est.

[3] Esto vero AB circulus isoper(ime)t(er) DEF poli(gonio). [5] Inscribatur circulus polygonio, cuius semidiameter est GH. [7] Ratio, AC semi(diame)ter maior est GH

semi(diametro), et AB circulus iso(perime)t(er) poli(goni)o. [7a] Ergo quod fit ex ductu AC in AB circumferentiam maius est eo quod fit ex ductu GH in DEF peri(me)trum. [9] Sed hoc est duplum circuli, [8] illud duplum poli(goni)i. [10] Ergo duplum duplo maius. [11] Ergo subduplum subduplo (fol. 179r, lines 25-29).

FY₂ [1a] *Omnium isoperimetricorum maximum est circulus.*

[3] Proponatur ergo circulus, et sit polig(onium) P cir [crossed out] ei isoperimetricum maius eo, si fieri potest. [3a] OC circulus sit alit(er) [?] poligonium, sit DEF. [5] Dato poligono equilatero et equiangulo et equiangulo [!] circumulum inscribe, per xii Eucl(idis). Fiat et ducatur semidi(ame)ter a puncto contactus in P. Fiat diameter in alio circulo AO. [6] Inde sic, ambitus polig(onii) P <maior est> circulo, quia includit eum. Ergo et circulus est maior P circulo et ambitus O est equalis ambitui polig(onii). [6a] Sed que est proportio circuli ad circumulum ea est diameter ad diametrum duplicata. Sed circulus maior circulo, diameter maior diametro. [7] Ergo semi(di)a(me)ter sem(idiame)tro. [7a] Ergo maior [!] maius] est id quod fit ex ductu AC in ambitum circuli quam quod fit ex ductu P in am [!] ambitum poligonii. [9] Sed hoc duplum circuli, [8] illud duplum poligonii. [10] Ergo maius est duplum circuli quam duplum poligonii. [12] Ergo maius [!] est circulus poligonio (fol. 97v, lines 23-41).

FY₃ [1a] *Circulus est maximum omnium sibi ysoperimetricorum.*

[3] Sit AB circumferentia, CDEFGO ambitui poligonii equalis, [3b] et sit illud poligonium intra sibi ysopleura et ysoperimetra maximum. Unde opus erit equilaterum et equiangulum, per proximam. [5] Inscribatur igitur sibi circulus cuius semi(diame)ter sit HI. [6] Semi(diame)ter autem circuli dati ysoperimetri cum poligono sit AM. Cum igitur circumferentia poligonii sit maior circumferentia circuli sibi inscripti et circumferentia circuli dati sit equalis circumferentie poligonii, sequitur circumferentiam AB circuli dati esse maiorem circumferentia circuli inscripti poligono. Igitur circulus datus est maior circulo inscripto, [7] quare semi(diame)ter circuli maioris maior erit semi(diame)tro circuli minoris. Sit [!] sic? AM maior est A [crossed out] HI. [9] Area aut(em) circuli AB surgit ex ductu semi(diame)tri AM in me(dieta)tem circumferentie AB. [8] Et area poligonii surgit ex ductu HI in medietatem circumferentie poligonii, quod est equalis me(dieta)ti circumferentie AB. [10a] Sed productorum et producentium eadem est proportio. Cum itaque AM sit maior HI et me(die)tas perif(er)ie sit eadem, [12] sequitur quoniam circulus est maior poligono (fol. 145r, lines 24-43).

FY₄ [1a] *Circulus est maximum omnium sibi ysoperimetricorum.*

[3] Prob(ati)o. Sit AB circumferentia equalis E [crossed out] CDEFG ambitui poligonii, [3b] per maximam [!] proximam] predictam, c' [!] cum] CDFG sit maximum omnium sibi ysoperimetricorum erit equilaterum et equiangulum. [5] Discribatur [!] ergo circulus illi poligono et [?] per 4^{um} Elementorum [6] protrahatur semidiam(eter) ad cent(ru)m iunctoque circulo, t(ame)n [!] cum?] ergo circumfere(ntia) et [?] AB fit [!] sit] equalis ambitui poligonii, fit maior circumferentia circuli inspecti [!] inscripti] – erit AB circumferentia maior EH sententia [!] circuli inscripti. [8] Ex hoc s(equi)tur per quadratum [!] quadraturam] circuli quod fit ex ductu HU [!] HI?] semidiam(etr)i in circumulum [!] ambitus poligonii est duplum ad poligonium. [9] Sed quod fit ex ductu AM in AB circumferentiam est duplum ad circumulum. [10a] Sed HM semidiam(eter) est maior HI. Sed

productorum et producentium eadem est proportio. [10] Ergo duplum ad AB circulum est maius duplo ad polygonium. [12] Ergo circulus est maior (fol. 12rb, lines 2-19).

Comments

The parallel treatments of this section of the tract reveal more clearly than other sections the relations among the different versions.

It is evident that FY₁ reproduces faithfully the wording of FY's enunciation; indeed, most of the discrepancies, minor as they are, appear as variants in some of the manuscripts of FY (consult Busard's apparatus), in particular, codex 'B' (Basel, Öffentliche Bibliothek der Universität, F.II.33, s. xiv) or 'O' (Oxford, Bodleian Library Digby 174, s. xiii, fols. 135r-136v). Since FY₁ also occurs in O (fols. 178v-179r), it seems reasonable to suppose that the paraphrase it gives was based on a copy in this particular line of FY.

As we have seen before for FY₂, many places are either only barely legible, or effectively unintelligible through scribal error. The consequent uncertainty, however, does not affect points bearing on my discussion of the source relations of these texts. The specific connection with FY₁ is unmistakable in the closely parallel wordings of [7]-[10]. The wording in [3a] 'OC circulus sit alit(er?) polygonium' ought to read something like 'OC circulus sit alius, equalis polygonio'. But the reasoning here is confused: for the phrase 'sit DEF' that immediately follows suggests a connection with 'polygonium DEF' in FY₁ [3]. The difficulty is that FY₂, by its phrase 'si fieri potest', incorrectly conceives the argument as indirect, and so apparently feels the need to introduce this second figure DEF; but as the proof develops, only the first polygon is required. Like FY, FY₂ supplies the argument in [6] that FY₁ has omitted; but the wording in [6a] indicates that FY₂ is improvising, without recourse to the manner of FY.

FY₃ follows the argument of FY carefully, but modifies the wording freely. Its agreement with FY in the handling of [6] is notable, in view of the divergent manners in FY₁ and FY₂.

FY₄ follows FY₃ for both technique and wording. Especially striking is their agreement in wording at [3], and their inclusion of [3b] and [10a], steps missing from the other versions. The citation of *De quadratura circuli* at [8] seems misplaced, being more appropriate for [9]; but the editor possibly knows of a version of the tract where both product rules — for the regular polygon and the circle — are proved, as is the case for the Florence Version (IB) and others.

III. Excerpts from Proposition 7.

FY [1] Adiaceat autem similiter et superficiei spere ysoperimetre solido equalis circulus GD et ab ipso conus altitudinem habens eam que ex centro spere, . . . [2] et est GDT conus equalis spere velut colligitur ex eis que Archimendis. . . [3] Quoniam vero conus basim habens circulum equalem superficiei spere altitudinemque equalem ei que ex centro spere equalis est spere colligitur ex eis que Archimendis ita. [4] Quoniam enim demonstravit quod cilindrus basim habens maximum circulum altitudinemque dyametrum spere sesqual-

ter est spere, [5] talis vero cilindrus sextuplus est coni basim equidem habentis eandem, altitudinem vero eam que ex centro, [6] quadrupla erit spera talis coni. [7] Est autem et eiusdem quadruplus et conus altitudinem quidem habens eandem, basim vero superficiei spere equalem, [8] sub eadem enim altitudine existentes ad invicem sunt sicut bases, [9] superficies autem [! vero] spere quadrupla est maximi circuli. [10] Quare equalis spera dicto cono (ed. Busard, lines 252-254, 256-257, 258-267).

FY, [4] Item, intelligatur columpna quedam, cuius basis equatur maximo circulo spere DEFG, axis vero diametro DF, eritque columpna sexquialtera ad speram, secundum octavam eiusdem. [1] Et cointelligatur [!] piramis fundata super eandem basem, cuius altitudo me(die)tas axis cone.... [5] Ratio. To(ta)lis [! talis?] co(lump)na sextupla est ad maiorem pira(mi)dem, [5a] quod liquet, cum quolibet ad suam sit tripla. [4bis] Et sexquialtera est ad speram DEFG. [6] Ergo eadem spera quadrupla est ad maiorem pyramidem. [9] Item, superficies spere DEFG quadrupla est ad maximum circulum eiusdem spere, [9a] quod facile demonstrabitur, mediantibus [9b] quad(ra)n(g)ulo contento sub lineis equalibus diametro et maximo circulo spere DEFG, cui equatur superficies spere eiusdem, secundum vi^{am} Archimedis, [9c] et triangulo orthogonio, cuius duo latera an(gu)lum rectum continentia equantur semi(diame)tro maximi circuli et maximo circulo spere DEFG, qui equatur eidem circulo, ut ostendit Arch(imenides) in quadratura (circuli) (fol. 179v, lines 32-34, 35-38).

FY₂ [The extant text is defective].

FY₃, [1] Adiaceat etiam circulus GD equalis superficiei spere K, super quo intelligatur conus equicruris, habens eam altitudinem que est ex centro spere K ... [2] 2^{as} (conus) autem equalis est spere K, ut colligitur ex eis que demonstravit Archimenes in 8^{va} de curvis superficibus.... [4] Demonstrat itaque Archimenes loco dicto de curvis superficibus, chelindrus habens basim maximum circulum corporis qui in spera, altitudinemque dyametro spere, sesquialterus est spere. [5] Talis vero kilindrus [!] sextuplus est coni habentis basim maximum circulum corporis qui in spera, altitudinem vero que ex centro spere. [6] Quadrupla igitur erit spera ad talem conum. [7] Est et ad eundem conum quidam conus quadruplus, qui habet eandem altitudinem cum priori cono, basim vero quadruplam ad basim primam. [8] Nam coni sub eadem altitudine existentes sunt ad invicem sicut bases. [9] Sed superficies spere quadrupla est ad maximum circulum corporis qui in spera. [10] Quare conus basim habens equalem superficiei spere, altitudinem vero eam que ex centro, equalis est spere (fol. 145v, lines 16-18, 21-23, 25-38).

FY₄ This text agrees verbatim with FY but for scribal errors and the following (cf. the equivalent included in [3-4] of FY and [2] of FY₃): colligitur ex Archimene ita quia demonstravit in octava de curvis (fol. 12rb, lines 44-45).

Comments

The excerpts cover the lemma, embedded within prop. 7, establishing that the sphere equals a cone whose base equals the surface of the sphere and whose height equals its radius.

In FY, I indicate a suggested emendation of *autem* to *vero* at [9]; this is required by the logic of the proof and also agrees with the Greek, whose 'de' must be read as if in an implied '(men) ... de ...' construction. In this way, [8] and [9] together are premises toward the claim in [7]. Busard, following the Latin, ends [8] with a full stop and [9] with a comma, whence [9] becomes a premise toward the conclusion in [10]. One can view this as a subtle error on the part of the translator.

FY₃ keeps especially close to FY throughout the whole proposition. In the quoted extract FY₃ includes all the steps of FY and in the same order, save that FY₃ does not repeat [2] at [3], as FY does. The wording of FY is also retained as model by FY₃; for instance, the dictions with 'habens' in [1], [4] and [5]; 'talis cilindrus' in [5]; and the phrasing with 'existentes' in [8]. There are minor differences: for instance, FY₃ volunteers 'equicruris' in [1], adds 'corporis' in [4] and [5], recapitulates the conclusion more fully than FY in [10], and amplifies its Archimedes citations with explicit references to *De curvis superficiebus* in [2] and [4]. One should note that in its other propositions FY₃ corresponds to FY far more loosely than this.

The scribe of FY₂ mistakenly recopies the proof of prop. 6 at this point of prop. 7, so that the extant text is not suitable for comparisons. Similarly, the same scribe in FY₄ transmits verbatim the text of FY for prop. 7 (presumably, this too is a scribal error); its two divergences from FY (one of which occurs within the cited passage, as shown) are reminiscent of the modified citations of Archimedes in FY₃.

FY₁ adheres only in part to the model of FY in prop. 7. In the cited portion the terminology is freely adapted, steps are inserted or deleted, and the order revised. The editor does not actually state the volume relation [2] (= [3] = [10]) as a separate result, although it is an immediate inference from what he has established up to [9]. He also supplies a justification for the surface relation at [9], based on citations of *De curvis superficiebus* and *De quadratura circuli*. The agreement with *De curvis*, both in terminology and argument, is clear, as the text of CS prop. 9 reveals (ed. Clagett, *AMA* 1.502-504):

CS *Omnis spera est equalis rotunde piramidi cuius basis equatur superficiei spere et altitudo semidiametro spere.* [cf. 3]

[1] Esto exemplum A piramis rotunda cuius basis circulus NM sit equalis superficiei spere C et AB altitudo A sit equalis DC semidiametro C spere. [2] Dico quod spera C est equalis piramidi A.

[3a] Dispositio. Sumatur enim piramis E, cuius altitudo EI sit equalis AB et eius basis equalis maximo circulo spere C. [3b] Sumatur etiam columpna cuius basis sit equalis maximo circulo spere C et GH eius axis sit duplus ad DC.

[3c] Ratio. Age. GH columpna est duplo altior piramide E et sita est in equali basi cum E. [5] Ergo columpna GH est sextupla ad E piramidem. [5a] Si enim essent eiusdem altitudinis, columpna esset tripla ad E, per ix duodecimi [sc. Elementorum]. [3b, bis] Sed columpna GH sita est in basi FG circulo equali maximo circulo spere C et axis GH est equalis diametro spere C, ex dispositione. [4] Ergo columpna GH est sexquialtera ad speram C, per proximam [sc. prop. 8]. [5bis] Sed columpna GH erat sextupla ad E. [6] Ergo spera C est quadrupla ad E. [9b] Item, ex ductu diametri C spere in circumferentiam maximi circuli C spere, i.e. basis E piramidis, sit curva

superficies spere C, per sextam huius, scilicet MN circulus. [9c] Et quod fit ex ductu diametri spere C in circumferentiam maximi circuli spere C est quadruplum ad circumulum maximum spere C, per primam Archimedis de mensura circuli. [9] Ergo a duplici pari circulus MN est quadruplus basi pyramidis E. [8] Sed E et A pyramides sunt eiusdem altitudinis. [7] Ergo A pyramis est quadrupla E pyramidi, per xii [sc. librum Elementorum]. [6bis] Sed C spera fuerat quadrupla ad E. [10] Ergo A pyramis est equalis C spere. Ad quod astruendum aspiravimus.

It is evident that the terminology is fully in agreement with FY₁, embracing not only technical terms like ‘curva superficies’ and ‘columpna’, but also general terms, like ‘ratio’ and ‘item’. Both include steps like [5a], [9b] and [9c], absent from FY, and deviate from the expressions of FY, like those with ‘habens’ to designate the dimensions of the solids. Nevertheless, CS adheres to an order of proof virtually identical to that in FY from step [3b, bis] on, but for the inverted order of [9], [8], [7]. The latter is an improvement, for it restores the natural logical order and removes the error entailed in FY’s ‘autem’ in [9] (see remark above). This manner of treatment contrasts markedly with FY₁, which modifies the order and omits several of the steps, and, indeed, does not actually state or derive the very relation of solids [3] that is the object of this lemma in FY and CS.

One might thus propose that the editor of CS has consulted FY as model for prop. 9, then in turn consulted prop. 9 in his editing FY₁. Such a procedure would decidedly be strange, and it conflicts with another textual pattern: that the version in CS retains no specific wording from FY, whereas FY₁ does (e.g. ‘intelligatur’ in [4] appears also earlier in FY, and ‘talis’ may be indicated in [5]; furthermore, ‘conice superficies’ and ‘adiaceat’ appear in both FY and FY₁ in other parts of the proposition). I would thus propose instead that the editor of CS has at his disposal a source document similar to (but separate from) that in FY — specifically, as a lemma in the Greek or Greco-Latin source on which CS depends. Thus, the similarity of conception and technique would result from the sources, whereas the similarity of expression would be assigned to the editor. But even if one assumed that the text in CS is here based on FY, it would still be clear that the same editor has produced both the versions in CS and FY₁; the parallels in phrasing cannot well be explained otherwise.

IV. Lemma Following Prop. 1.

FY [1] Quoniam vero GT recta ad TK maiorem proportionem habet quam angulus GZT ad angulum KZT [1a] demonstratum autem est Theoni in commemoratione parvi astronomi, nihilominus vero et nunc demonstrabitur. [2] Centro enim Z et spatio ZK circuli periferia describatur MKN et educatur ZT in N. [8] Quoniam ergo est sicut GK ad KT ita GKZ trigonum ad KZT, [5] recta GK ad KT maiorem proportionem habet quam MKZ sector ad ZKN sectorem [6] et componenti. [10] Sed sicut sector ad sectorem ita angulus ad angulum, [11] maiorem proportionem habet GT ad TK quam GZT angulus ad KZT angulum (ed. Busard, lines 31-38).

FY₁ [1] Restat ergo probare quod maior sit proportio LE lineae ad LN lineam quam me(dieta)tis K ad K medialem. [2] Dispositio. Circumvolvatur quedam circumferentia

intra maiorem circulum ita [?] que transeat per NP, et protrahatur LK ad eandem circumferentiam et habebis NP<K> sectorem. [3] Age. Maior est proportio KNE trianguli ad LNK triangulum quam KNP sectoris ad eundem, [3a] cum sector sit minor, [4] et maior proportio eiusdem sectoris ad eundem triangulum quam ad KRN sectorem. [5] Ergo a p(rim)o maior est proportio KNE trianguli ad KLN triangulum quam parvi sectoris ad maiorem. [6] Ergo coniunctim maior est proportio illorum duorum triangulorum ad KNL quam illorum duorum sectorum ad KRN sectorem. [7] Ergo maior est totalis trianguli ad KLN quam totalis sectoris ad KRN. [8] Sed que est totalis trianguli ad triangulum KLN est LE ad LN, quoniam sunt eiusdem altitudinis. [9] Ergo maior est LE ad LN quam sectoris ad sectorem. [10] Sed sectoris ad sectorem est que anguli ad angulum, sicut probatur per ultimam vi^{ti} Euclidis. [11] Ergo maior est LE lineae ad LN lineam quam sit me(dieta)tis K ad K medialem, quod proposuimus (fol. 178v, lines 16-22).

FY₂ [1] Item maior sit proportio IE ad DI quam anguli MN ad N sic constet [2] ad quantitatem lineae CD fiat circulus et producatur CI ad circumferentiam illud [! ad Q?]. [3a] Inde sic, EMC<D> triangulus maior est MC<D> sectore, [3b] secud [! set IND?] trigonus est minor END [? QND?] sectore. [5] Ergo maiorem propor(tionem) <habet> EMC ad INC quam MD ad M. [6] Ergo maiorem proportionem ME<C> et IND, i.<e.> totalis trigoni, ad IND trigonum quam CM et CNQ ad CNQ. [10] Set que est sectoris ad sectoris [!] ad sectorem ea anguli ad angulum, per tertium [? sextum], ergo maior est proportio EQ [! ECI?] ad CAD [! IND?] quam anguli MN ad N. [8] Set que est trianguli ad triangulum eadem est basis ad basim, per vi, quoniam sunt eiusdem altitudinis. [11] Ergo maior est proportio basis EI ad ID quam anguli NM ad angulum N (fol. 96va, lines 38-52).

FY₃ [1] Quia vero maior sit proportio AC ad FC quam anguli AEC ad angulum FEC sic patet. [2] Nam facto super E centro circulo secundum qu(antit)atem semi(diame)tri EF circulus secabit AE, sit in O, et secabit EC continuatam, sit in P. [3a] Tunc sic, unus sector sc. OEF est pars trianguli AEF. [3] Maior est igitur proportio trianguli AEF ad triangulum FEC quam sit sectoris OEF ad triangulum FEC, per p(rim)am partem 8^{ve} 5^{ti}. [4] Proportio autem sectoris OEF ad triangulum FEC maior est quam sit proportio eiusdem sectoris ad sectorem FEP, per 2^{am} partem 8^{ve} 5^{ti}. [5] Igitur a fortiori maior est proportio trianguli AEF ad triangulum FEC quam sectoris OEF ad sectorem FEP. [6] Ergo coniunctim per 28^{vam} 5^{ti} [7] maior est proportio trianguli AEC ad triangulum FEC quam sit sectoris OEP ad sectorem FEP. [10] Sed sector OEP ad sectorem FEP sicut angulus AEC ad angulum FEC. Maior est igitur proportio trianguli AEC ad triangulum FEC quam sit anguli AEC ad angulum FEC. [8] Trianguli autem AEC ad triangulum FEC est sicut proportio AC ad FC, per p(ri)mam sexti [6b] et coniunctim. [11] Igitur proportio AC ad FC est maior quam anguli AEC ad angulum FEC, quod erat ultimo probandum. (fol. 142r, lines 42-142v, line 21; cf. Clagett's transcription, *AMA* 5.578)

FY₄ [1] Probatio eius quod restat probandum, quod maior sit proportio I ad F quam anguli oppositi I ad angulum oppositum F. [2] Describatur circulus secundum quantitatem C lineae, sit ex predictis circulis negotiandum etiam [8] quod est I ad F ea est trianguli ad triangulum, per primam 6^{ti}, [10] et que est sectoris ad sectorem est e(tiam) [?] anguli ad

angulum, per vi librum. [3a] Sed maius [! unus?] sector est pars ad triangulum exseuntem [!] a circulo. [3] Maior est ergo proportio lineae ad lineam <sc.> I ad F quam sectoris ad t^m [? 1^{um}?] triangulum ortogoneum. [3b] Sed idem triangulus est pars cetogonius [! ortogonius?] ad primum sectorem. [4] Ergo per v^{um} librum minor sector tollatur t(ame)n [? cum?] r^o [? 1^o?] sectore et cum triangulo ortogonio ad maiorem minorem habebit (pro)portionem, ergo ad primum sectorem minorem habebit (pro)portionem quam ad triangulum ortogonium. [5] Ergo a p(rim)o maior est (pro)portio I ad F quam sectoris ad sectorem, [11] ergo quam anguli oppositi ad [underscored, as if to delete] I ad angulum oppositum F, et hoc erat ultimo probandum (fol. 11ra, line 54-11rb, line 16).

FY₆ [2] Et fiat circulus secundum quantitatem ZK super centrum Z et extendatur linea ZT usque ad C [3b] et patet quod maior est sector ZKC quam triangulus ZKT [3a] et triangulus ZGK maior est quam sector ZHK [3] quare minor est proportio ZKT trianguli ad sectorem ZHK quam sectoris ZHC [! ZKC] et ad idem, s. sectorem ZHK, per 8T [! 8^{vam}?] 5^u. [5] Ergo multo magis minor est proportio ZKT trianguli ad triangulum GZ [deleted?] ZGK quam sectoris Z [deleted] ZKC ad sectorem ZHK. [8] Sed proportio trianguli ad triangulum est TK basis ad KG basim, per primum [!] 6^u, [10] sectoris vero ad sectorem est anguli KZC ad angulum GZK, per ultimam 8T [! 6^u ?]. [11] Ergo minor est proportio TK ad KG quam anguli TZK <ad angulum GZK>. [11a] Ergo econverso maior est proportio GK lineae ad KT <quam> GZK anguli et ad KZT angulum, [6] quidem si composuimus [7] maior est proportio GT ad KT quoniam [! quam] anguli GZT ad angulum <KZT> (fol. 6ra, line 48-6rb, line 7).

Comments

My numbering scheme takes FY₁ as paradigm, it being the amplest version. The other three paraphrases tend to follow the general pattern of FY₁, with occasional additions, deletions or transpositions, rather than that of FY. In particular, the presence of steps [3] and [4] in FY₃ and that of [3a] in FY₂ and FY₃ link these versions to FY₁, against the model of FY.

The conformity to FY₁'s ordering is especially close in FY₃. Indeed, but for the transposition of the steps [8] and [10] they would be entirely identical. On specific points, one may note the presence of 'coniunctim' in [6] (contrast FY's 'componenti'), and 'a fortiori' in [5] answering to FY₁'s 'a primo'. Since FY₄ supports 'a primo' at the equivalent place, it seems likely that this was the original reading in FY₃.

FY₂ generally agrees with the ordering of FY₁, and sometimes also with its specific wording, as at [8]. But FY₂ deletes the intermediate steps [3] and [4], executes the addition in [6] without the explicit term ('coniunctim'), and transposes [8] and [10]. This transposition happens to agree with the order in FY₃, while its wording of [2] (sc. 'quantitatem') is also reminiscent of that in FY₃. In view of this, one might wish to allow that FY₂ has been edited not only from FY₁, but also with awareness of FY₃ or some text dependent on it (e.g., FY₆ or the annotated text of *Liber Philotegni*, prop. 5; see section v).

Making sense of FY₂ is complicated not only through frequent errors by the scribe, but also through a confusing notation followed by his source. Although the center of the circle

is C, the central angles corresponding to the two sectors are denoted M, N, respectively, and their sum as MN; thus, the sectors and triangles that contain these angles are denoted via the letter M or N, where we would expect C.

FY₃ conforms well with FY₁, including all its steps in the same order, but for the omission of [9] and the transposition of [8] and [10]. In [2]-[3a], the words 'facto...Tunc sic' appear in the upper margin of fol. 142v in place of deleted lines; see note 49.

FY₄ reflects the wording of FY₃ in step [2] ('secundum quantitatem'), as also in [3a] ('pars') and in [11] ('ultimo'). But the editor appears to have attempted major changes in order, e.g. the transposition of [8] and [10] to the beginning of the proof. In particular, he develops the proof from the terms as in the enunciation (the ratio of angles and the associated bases) toward the corresponding area elements (the sectors and triangles), rather than in the opposite order, as in the other versions. His manner of handling the composition step is confusing, for 'tollatur' in [4] ought to denote subtraction, not addition, while in [8] he is already considering the ratio in terms of the whole triangle corresponding to the whole base I. We can obtain his step [5] if we take [3b] with [4] to mean that 'since triangle B < sector B, sect. A + tri. B: tri. B > sect. A + sect. B: sect. B'. This is a valid inference, by the same theorems in fact (V 8 together with Campanus' V 28) that are cited in step [6] of FY₃. It is clear, in any event, that FY₄ has taken liberties with its source.

In step [5] FY₄ agrees with FY₁ in its term 'a primo' where FY₃ holds the more conventional 'a fortiori'. But FY₃ elsewhere has 'a primo' together with 'multo fortius' (e.g. in prop. 3), where FY₄ reads the same. I thus suspect that in the extant text of FY₃, the term 'a fortiori' in the lemma has replaced an original 'a primo'. Since FY₃ exists only in the late copy by Regiomontanus, this could be a scribal alteration due to him.

FY₆ adheres reasonably well to the model as in FY₁ and FY₃, with frequent changes due to the editor. The presence of both [3a] and [3b], and the Euclid references in [3], [8] and [10] suggest specific connection to FY₃ (as we would assume from the wording of prop. 1, given above). But the editor needlessly inverts his ratios (hence the need for step [11a]), and he defers the addition step [6] to the end. The omission of step [4] is an error which is likely due to the scribe, since 'multo fortius' in [5] implies its presence in the exemplar.

Stanford University.

'THE KING TAUGHT US THE LESSON':
BENEDICTINE SUPPORT FOR HENRY V'S
SUPPRESSION OF THE LOLLARDS*

Patrick J. Horner

IN a recent essay assessing the kingship of Henry v of England, G. L. Harriss has argued that Henry's success lay not in innovation but in restoration, in demonstrating that, even after the political upheavals and religious controversies of the reigns of Richard II and Henry IV, the 'perfected system of medieval English government could be made to work' by a king who vigorously asserted his traditional role as head of the body politic.¹ Henry's efforts at religious reform,² especially his suppression of the Lollard heretics, may well have been inspired, to some degree at least, by a similar desire to restore traditional religious orthodoxy. Nevertheless, his actions revealed, ironically, how much the traditional relationship between spiritual and temporal power had changed; how much, in fact, the power of secular authority had increased and how dependent on it ecclesiastical officials had become.³ Indeed, as Jeremy Catto suggests:

* I am grateful to the Bodleian Library for permission to quote from the manuscripts discussed and to its staff for gracious assistance for many years. I am also grateful to the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation and the University of Pennsylvania under whose auspices the research for this article began, and to the Henry E. Huntington Library, San Marino, California, and the Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies of the University of California at Los Angeles at whose facilities it was completed. I wish to thank Leonard E. Boyle, OP, John W. McKenna, Russell Hope Robbins, and Siegfried Wenzel, who have encouraged this research and much improved it by their criticism. Any faults that remain are my responsibility alone. An earlier, abbreviated version of the essay was read at the Fifteenth-Century Studies Conference in Regensburg, West Germany, in August 1983.

¹ G. L. Harriss, 'Introduction: The Exemplar of Kingship' in *Henry v. The Practice of Kingship*, ed. G. L. Harriss (Oxford, 1985), p. 27.

² For a recent assessment of Henry's reform activities, see J. I. Catto, 'Religious Change under Henry v' in Harriss, *Henry V*, pp. 97-115.

³ For a summary of the history and development of this issue, see R. W. and A. J. Carlyle, *A History of Mediaeval Political Theory in the West*, 6 vols. (Edinburgh, 1903-1936), 1.175-93, 253-92; and especially 4.211-97; and more recently, I. S. Robinson, 'Church and Papacy' in *The Cambridge History of Medieval Political Thought c. 350-c. 1450*, ed. J. H. Burns (Cambridge, 1988), pp. 252-305. For the implications of Wyclif's theory of dominion on the relationship of temporal and ecclesiastical power, see J.-P. Genet, 'Ecclesiastics and Political Theory in Late Medieval England: The End of Monopoly' in *The Church, Politics and Patronage in the Fifteenth Century*, ed. R. B. Dobson (Gloucester, 1984), pp. 23-44.

There is a case for locating a major turning point in the history of the English church in the events of his [Henry's] reign.... From the Leicester parliament of 1414 until the triumph of toleration in the eighteenth century, religion was established and enforced by public authority, and dissentient voices subjected to the rigours of statutory felony.... In all but name, more than a century before the title could be used, Henry v had begun to act as the supreme governor of the Church of England.⁴

This essay will examine Benedictine opposition to Lollardy in the late fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, especially the views of an anonymous preacher preserved in the sermons of Oxford, Bodleian Library Bodley 649. While the name of this preacher remains uncertain, allusions within the sermons make clear his Benedictine affiliation and his university training at Oxford. References to historical events also suggest that most of the sermons were composed around the time of Henry v's reign, many of them after the Lollard uprising of 1414 led by Sir John Oldcastle.⁵ This preacher's caustic denunciations of the Lollards as the principal cause of the dangers confronting England and his extravagant gratitude to Henry v for his decisive attack on them represent a significant change in attitude to that expressed forty years earlier by his eminent Benedictine confrere from Norwich cathedral priory, Bishop Thomas Brinton of Rochester, who had spoken out vigorously against similar dangers at the start of the Wycliffite controversy in the late 1370's and early 1380's.⁶ This change in attitude, which also appears in other

⁴ Catto, 'Religious Change under Henry v', 97, 115.

⁵ For a discussion of the date and Benedictine provenance of the manuscript, see my essay, 'Benedictines and Preaching in Fifteenth-Century England: The Evidence of Two Bodleian Library Manuscripts', *Revue Bénédictine* 99 (1989) 313-32. R. M. Haines has discussed these sermons in "Wilde Wittes and Wilfulnes": John Swetstock's Attack on Those "Poyswunmongeres", the Lollards' in *Popular Belief and Practice*, ed. G. J. Cumming and D. Baker, (Studies in Church History 8; Cambridge, 1971), 143-53; and in 'Church, Society and Politics in the Early Fifteenth Century as Viewed from an English Pulpit' in *Church, Society and Politics*, ed. D. Baker, (Studies in Church History 12; Oxford, 1975), 143-57; he has printed one sermon in full in "Our Master Mariner, Our Sovereign Lord": A Contemporary Preacher's View of King Henry v', *Mediaeval Studies* 38 (1978) 85-96. Professor Haines and I have discussed this manuscript and another, Oxford, Bodleian Library Laud Misc. 706, which contains four sermons found in Bodley 649. Some of the sermons in Laud Misc. 706 are attributed to John Paunteley, a Benedictine monk of St. Peter's Abbey, Gloucester (as Haines noted in "Wilde Wittes", 144, and in 'Church, Society and Politics', 144, 156-57). For further biographical details on Paunteley, see my 'An Edition of Five Medieval Sermons from MS Laud Misc. 706' (Diss., State University of New York at Albany, 1975), pp. 42-47, and for a sermon attributed to Paunteley, see my essay, 'John Paunteley's Sermon at the Funeral of Walter Froucester, Abbot of Gloucester (1412)', *The American Benedictine Review* 28 (1977) 147-66. I have profited much from Professor Haines' essays, but my analysis differs considerably from his by placing the preacher of Bodley 649 within the context of the history of Benedictine involvement in the Lollard controversy and by examining the latter's use of homiletic and literary figures. More recently, the anti-Lollard characteristics of these sermons have been discussed briefly by A. Hudson, *The Premature Reformation* (Oxford, 1988), pp. 58, 436-37. Hudson's book appeared after completion of this essay, but I have tried to incorporate her work wherever relevant.

⁶ For Bishop Brinton's sermons, see M. A. Devlin, *The Sermons of Thomas Brinton, Bishop of Rochester (1373-1389)*, 2 vols. (Camden Society, 3rd Ser. 85-86; London, 1954) hereafter cited as

Benedictine writers of Henry's time, reflects the complex political and religious struggle of orthodox ecclesiastical officials to gain the support of secular authorities in suppressing Wyclif and his disciples.

To achieve this objective, as Margaret Aston and Gordon Leff have shown,⁷ ecclesiastical strategy attempted to portray Wyclif and his disciples as political subversives by arguing that the Wycliffite doctrine of clerical disendowment, namely the right of secular authorities to deprive the clergy of their temporal possessions, would ultimately threaten all possessions and the stability of the entire kingdom.⁸ In some ways, of course, this was a risky strategy, for it called attention to the Church's wealth and to a justification for removing it which must have appealed to many, even those with little religious motivation. It also led, as H. G. Richardson has shown, to greater involvement by secular authorities in ecclesiastical affairs.⁹ However, to ecclesiastical officials Henry v's actions in putting down the Lollard uprising of 1414 must have seemed a vindication of their strategy and, especially to 'possessioners' like the Benedictines, a cause for jubilation. But, as Catto suggests, the long-term effects of this increase in royal power were to have far different consequences.

Before discussing the views of Brinton and the fifteenth-century Benedictines, it will be useful to review briefly the history of the order's early opposition to Wyclif

Brinton; for other biographical sketches of Brinton, see *DNB* 2.1258 and A. B. Emden, *A Biographical Register of the University of Oxford to A.D. 1500*, 3 vols. (Oxford, 1957-59), 1.268-69; hereafter cited as *BRUO*; F. A. Gasquet, 'A Forgotten English Preacher' in *The Old English Bible and Other Essays* (London, 1908), pp. 54-86; D. M. Knowles, *The Religious Orders in England*, 3 vols. (Cambridge, 1948-59), 2.58-60. Brinton's sermons are cited extensively in G. R. Owst, *Preaching in Medieval England. An Introduction to Sermon Manuscripts of the Period c. 1350-1450* (Cambridge, 1926) and *Literature and Pulpit in Medieval England. A Neglected Chapter in the History of English Letters & of the English People* (Cambridge, 1933).

⁷ M. Aston, 'Lollardy and Sedition, 1381-1431', *Past and Present* 17 (1960) 1-44 (rpt. in M. Aston, *Lollards and Reformers. Images and Literacy in Late Medieval Religion* [London, 1984], pp. 1-48); G. Leff, *Heresy in the Later Middle Ages. The Relation of Heterodoxy to Dissent c. 1250-c. 1450*, 2 vols. (Manchester, 1967), 2.561-96; the most influential study prior to these was that by K. B. McFarlane, *John Wycliffe and the Beginnings of English Nonconformity* (London, 1952). The most recent account of the early years of the Wycliffite controversy appears in Hudson, *Premature Reformation*, pp. 60-103.

⁸ For statements on this matter from Wyclif's writings, see, for example, *Iohannis Wycliffe, Tractatus de civili dominio, Liber primus*, ed. R. L. Poole (London, 1885), pp. 265-74; *Liber secundus*, ed. J. Loserth (London, 1900), pp. 136-38; *Tractatus de officio regis*, ed. A. W. Pollard and C. Sayle (London, 1887), p. 120; 'Responsiones ad XLIV conclusiones' in *Opera minora*, ed. J. Loserth (London, 1913), pp. 207-208, 225-41; for discussions of Wyclif's views, see E. C. Tatnall, 'John Wyclif and *Ecclesia Anglicana*', *The Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 20 (1969) 19-43; T. Renna, 'Wyclif's Attack on the Monks' in *From Ockham to Wyclif*, ed. A. Hudson and M. Wilks (Studies in Church History, Subsidia 5; Oxford, 1987), pp. 267-80; Hudson, *Premature Reformation*, pp. 334-46, 359-67.

⁹ H. G. Richardson, 'Heresy and Lay Power under Richard II', *The English Historical Review* 51 (1936) 1-28 (hereafter cited as *EHR*).

and to emphasize a few aspects of the Lollard controversy as portrayed in the accounts of Aston and Leff.

At first sight, a discussion of the Benedictines' role in the Wycliffite and Lollard controversies may seem unusual, for they have received far less attention than episcopal defenders of orthodoxy, such as William Courtenay¹⁰ and Thomas Arundel,¹¹ and mendicants, such as the Franciscan William Woodford¹² and the Dominican Roger Dymmok,¹³ and the Carmelite Thomas Netter.¹⁴ In the 1370's, however, when Wyclif joined the long-standing debates about dominion and grace, pontifical and royal power, and the right of the clergy to temporal possessions, some of his principal adversaries were Benedictines.¹⁵ His works, especially the publication of *De civili dominio* in 1375-76, prompted Adam of Easton, a Benedictine from Norwich Cathedral priory serving in the Roman curia, to write to Abbot Litlington of Westminster, the president of the provincial chapter, for copies of works 'against our order' and 'on royal power'.¹⁶ No doubt it was these copies, and presumably Adam's influence, which led to Pope Gregory xi's condemnation of Wyclif's ideas in 1377; and Adam himself, in his tract *Defensorium ecclesiae*, defends ecclesiastical and papal rights against a number of opponents, including Wyclif. In England, the news of the papal condemnation was first

¹⁰ J. H. Dahmus, *William Courtenay. Archbishop of Canterbury 1381-96* (University Park, Penn., 1966).

¹¹ For Arundel's early career, see M. Aston, *Thomas Arundel. A Study of Church Life in the Reign of Richard II* (Oxford, 1967), especially pp. 320-35; for a summary of his participation in the events during the reigns of Henry IV and Henry V, see E. F. Jacob, *The Fifteenth Century, 1399-1485* (Oxford, 1961), pp. 94-99.

¹² Woodford's anti-Wycliffite writings include *De causis condemnationis articulorum 18 damnatorum Johannis Wyclif*, printed in O. Gratius, *Fasciculus rerum expetendarum et fugiendarum*, ed. E. Brown, 2 vols. (London, 1690), 1.191-265; and *Responsiones contra Wiclevum et Lollardos*, edited by E. M. Doyle in 'William Woodford, O.F.M. (c. 1330-c. 1400). His Life and Works Together with a Study and Edition of His *Responsiones contra Wiclevum et Lollardos*', *Franciscan Studies* 43 (1983) 17-187.

¹³ R. Dymmok, *Liber contra xii errores et hereses Lollardorum*, ed. H. S. Cronin (London, 1922).

¹⁴ T. Netter (of Walden), *Fasciculi Zizaniorum magistri Johannis Wyclif cum tritico*, ed. W. W. Shirley (RS 5; London, 1858); *Doctrinale fidei Catholicae...*, ed. B. Blanciotti, 3 vols. (Venice, 1757-59).

¹⁵ For accounts of these controversies in the fourteenth century, especially those involving Archbishop Richard FitzRalph and monastic and mendicant spokesmen, see A. Gwynn, *The English Austin Friars in the Time of Wyclif* (London, 1940), pp. 59-73; Knowles, *Religious Orders* 2.61-73; and more recently P. R. Szitty, *The Antifraternal Tradition in Medieval Literature* (Princeton, 1986), pp. 99-112, 123-51.

¹⁶ W. A. Pantin, 'The *Defensorium* of Adam Easton', *EHR* 51 (1936) 675-80 in which he cites Adam's letter as printed in his *Documents Illustrating the Activities of the General and Provincial Chapters of the English Black Monks 1215-1540* (Camden Society, 3rd Ser., 45, 47, 54; London, 1931-37), 3.76-77. For biographical information on Easton, see *DNB* 6.333-34 and *BRUO* 1.620-21; Knowles, *Religious Orders* 2.56-58; W. A. Pantin, *The English Church in the Fourteenth Century* (Cambridge, 1955; rpt. Toronto, 1980), pp. 175-81.

made public by Bishop Brinton late in 1377.¹⁷ In addition, the general chapter of the order, probably in 1378, commissioned an official Benedictine response to Wyclif from John De Acley, a monk of Durham who had recently incepted in theology at Oxford, but this plan was thwarted by an order of the king's council which feared disturbances in the Church.¹⁸ Acley's commission may well have stemmed from the publication of the papal condemnation, or perhaps it was to have been a rejoinder to Wyclif's *Determinaciones*, polemical responses to the tracts of the Benedictines Uthred of Boldon and William Binham, which W. R. Thomson has recently assigned to 1377 and 1378.¹⁹ Its prohibition by the king's council, however, might also suggest government anxiety that Acley's work would be less an academic treatise than a retort to the justification of the breach of sanctuary at Westminster Abbey in the notorious Haulay/Shakyl affair which Wyclif had made at the Gloucester parliament of 1378.²⁰

Several points about these events of the 1370's deserve emphasis. First, the Benedictines, individually and officially, in England and in Rome, were prominent opponents of Wyclif. Second, the issues debated were concerned less with dogmatic statements, moral norms, and liturgical ritual—what might more properly be regarded today as religious matters—than with the political, social, and economic implications of the relationship between ecclesiastical and secular authorities. Third, although these matters had been of long-standing, widespread theoretical debate, their immediate practical consequences were clearly seen in the broaching of a plan for the disendowment of the clergy in the parliament of 1371²¹ and in the protracted argument in 1373 and 1374 between the pope and the king over clerical taxation.²² Finally, in these matters the Benedictine spokesmen often

¹⁷ J. H. Dahmus, *The Prosecution of John Wyclif* (New Haven, 1952), p. 55, citing Wyclif from *Tractatus de Ecclesia*, ed. J. Loserth (London, 1886), p. 354.

¹⁸ W. A. Pantin, 'A Benedictine Opponent of John Wyclif', *EHR* 43 (1928) 73-77.

¹⁹ W. R. Thomson, *The Latin Writings of John Wyclif. An Annotated Catalog* (Toronto, 1983): *Determinacio ad argumenta magistri Outredi*, pp. 229-30; *Ad argumenta Wilelmi Vyrinham determinacio/nes*, pp. 231-32. For editions of these treatises, see *Opera minora*, ed. J. Loserth (London, 1913), pp. 405-414, 415-30. The early prominence of Benedictine opposition is also evident from Wyclif's references to a 'canis niger' in his sermons (*Sermones* III, ed. J. Loserth, London, 1889, pp. 188, 246). There has been much debate about these allusions: the *Fasciculi Zizaniorum* (p. 239) suggests that it refers to John Wells (see note 27 below); H. B. Workman, *John Wyclif: A Study of the English Medieval Church*, 2 vols. (Oxford, 1926), 1.296, claims it is Uthred; Knowles suggests Easton (*Religious Orders* 2.69); and Dahmus says it may have been Bishop Brinton (*Prosecution*, p. 37); Thomson says the first reference is to an Austin friar (*Latin Writings of Wyclif*, pp. 152-53) and the second to John Wells (pp. 156-57).

²⁰ For accounts of the Haulay/Shakyl affair, see Workman, *John Wyclif* 1.314-24; McFarlane, *John Wycliffe*, pp. 86-87; M. McKisack, *The Fourteenth Century, 1307-1399* (Oxford, 1959), pp. 403-404; J. H. Dahmus, 'John Wyclif and the English Government', *Speculum* 35 (1960) 51-68; Hudson, *Premature Reformation*, pp. 64, 364, 379.

²¹ V. H. Galbraith, 'Articles Laid before the Parliament of 1371', *EHR* 34 (1919) 579-82.

²² See Workman, *John Wyclif* 1.217-30.

espoused positions which put the order in conflict not just with Wyclif but also with royal wishes or policy. Besides the Acley matter, there is the dramatic confrontation between the Black Prince and Uthred of Boldon which is recounted in the *Eulogium historiarum*. In it Uthred (whom Knowles calls the 'representative spokesman of the monastic body'),²³ alone among ecclesiastical representatives, attempted to defend papal prerogatives by invoking the famous analogy of the two swords of ecclesiastical and secular power.²⁴ The same analogy, put to quite different use by a fifteenth-century Benedictine, will suggest the change in the monks' views and in the Church's political position.

The Church's position on the politically subversive nature of Wycliffite thought was clear as early as Gregory xi's condemnation of 1377.²⁵ In his letter to Archbishop Sudbury and Bishop Courtenay, Gregory urged them to impress on Edward III that 'if well examined, they [Wyclif's ideas] threaten to destroy the whole kingdom.' The phrase 'if well examined' suggests that the far-reaching political implications of Wyclif's ideas might not have been self-evident, and indeed Gregory says nothing directly about them in his letter to the king. Instead, the tactical use of this argument is left to the discretion of ecclesiastical officials.²⁶ Even in the 1380's when Wyclif's radical statements on sacramental and pastoral matters had added a specifically religious and dogmatic element to the debate,²⁷ the

²³ Knowles, *Religious Orders* 2.51; for Uthred's career, see *DNB* 20.17-18, *BRUO* 1.212-13, Knowles, *Religious Orders* 2.48-54; Pantin, *English Church*, pp. 165-75; M. E. Marcett, *Uthred de Boldon, Friar William Jordan and Piers Plowman* (New York, 1938); J. Dunbabin, 'Careers and Vocations' in J. I. Catto, ed., *The History of the University of Oxford* 1 (Oxford, 1984), pp. 604-605 (a discussion of the *moine universitaire*).

²⁴ *Eulogium (historiarum sive temporis)*, ed. F. S. Haydon, 3 vols. (RS 9; London, 1858), 3.337-39. For other accounts of this incident, see Workman, *John Wyclif* 1.222-24, Gwynn, *English Austin Friars*, pp. 218-20, and J. I. Catto, 'The Alleged Great Council of 1374', *EHR* 82 (1967) 764-71. For a brief history of the imagery of the two swords in papal-imperial controversies, see Robinson, 'Church and Papacy', 300-305; Wyclif in his *Responsiones ad XLIV conclusiones* notes that his opponent has defended papal power by using the analogy of the two swords (*Opera minora*, p. 229).

²⁵ D. Wilkins, *Concilia Magnae Britanniae et Hiberniae*, 4 vols. (London, 1737), 3.116-18, 123-24; T. Walsingham, *Historia Anglicana*, ed. H. T. Riley, 2 vols. (RS 28; London, 1863), 1.345-53; *Chronicon Angliae*, ed. E. M. Thompson (RS 64; London, 1874), pp. 173-81.

²⁶ Dahmus, *Prosecution*, p. 45.

²⁷ As the bishops became more involved and as opposition to Wyclif grew among other religious orders, especially the mendicants, the Benedictines were no longer his most prominent opponents. Nevertheless, several members of the order were active in different aspects of the controversy. Simon Southerey (*BRUO* 3.1734) and Nicholas Radcliffe (*DNB* 16.576 and *BRUO* 3.1539) of St. Albans and John Wells of Ramsey (*DNB* 20.1139-40 and *BRUO* 3.2008) were members of the Blackfriars Council of 1382 which officially condemned certain of Wyclif's works as heretical (*Fasciculi Zizaniorum*, pp. 287-89). Wells also wrote a reply to Wyclif (*Fasciculi Zizaniorum*, pp. 238-41), and was active in defending orthodoxy in academic disputes at Oxford (A. Hudson, 'Wycliffism in Oxford 1381-1401' in *Wyclif in His Times*, ed. A. J. P. Kenny (Oxford, 1986), p. 68). Radcliffe was engaged in polemics of a more popular kind, writing a treatise in response to Lollard attacks on images

political danger appears in several episcopal documents which refer to 'heretical conclusions which threaten to subvert the tranquillity of the realm'.²⁸ But after the Lollards' daring public proclamation of their ideas during the Hilary parliament of 1395, including an attack on the Church's 'infatuation' with temporal possessions,²⁹ orthodox spokesmen such as Dymmok bluntly condemned them as seditious,³⁰ and a parliamentary measure of 1397 seeking the death penalty for

('Utrum sic licitum Christiano imagines crucifixi et piissime sue matris ac aliorum sanctorum devota instantia adorare', London, British Library Royal 6.D.x, fol. 274r and Royal 10.D.x, fol. 308v). Along with Abbot Thomas de la Mare, he was instrumental in the recantation of John Aston (*Fasciculi Zizaniorum*, pp. 331-33; Workman, *John Wyclif* 2.278; Dahmus, *Prosecution*, p. 118); for recent brief comments on Radcliffe's status as a major opponent of Wyclif, see Hudson, *Premature Reformation*, pp. 58, 93, 95, 98.

Benedictine opposition is also found in preaching to non-monastic audiences, an activity which had increased since its official encouragement by the general chapter of the order in 1363 (Pantin, *Chapters of the Black Monks* 2.11-12, 75-75, 211-14); see also, for example, B. F. Harvey, 'The Monks of Westminster and the University of Oxford' in *The Reign of Richard II. Essays in Honour of May McKisack*, eds. F. R. H. DuBoulay and C. M. Barron (London, 1971), pp. 118-19; M. Jennings, 'Monks and the "Artes praedicandi" in the Time of Ranulph Higden', *Revue Bénédictine* 86 (1976), 119-28; J. Coleman, *English Literature in History* (London, 1981), pp. 174, 296-97. There are sermons preached on official occasions, such as those of Brinton and that of John Langdon of Christchurch, Canterbury, who preached against the Lollards at the London synod of 1411 (*DNB* 11.538-39, *BRUO* 2.1093-94; W. A. Pantin, *Canterbury College, Oxford. Vol. 4* [Oxford Historical Society 30, Oxford, 1985], p. 224). There is the late-fourteenth/early-fifteenth century collection of sermons written in Latin (but intended, in part, for popular audiences) of Robert Rypon, sub-prior of Durham (*BRUO* 3.1618), who attacks the Lollards' heretical views on scripture, the sacraments and devotional images (London, British Library Harley 4894, fols. 31v-33r, 77v, 114v). Another manuscript of Benedictine provenance from the same period (Worcester Cathedral Library F. 10) contains three sermons in English with one attributed to Hugo Legat of St. Albans; the third of these sermons attacks the Lollards twice (*Three Middle English Sermons from the Worcester Chapter Manuscript F. 10*, ed. D. M. Grisdale [Leeds School of English Language, Texts and Monographs 5; Leeds, 1939], pp. 51, 65-66). Even as late as 1469, John Stone, a monk of Christchurch, Canterbury, records the preaching of his confreres William Sellyng (*BRUO* 3.1666; Pantin, *Canterbury College*, p. 226) and William Thornden (*BRUO* 3.1865; Pantin, *Canterbury College*, p. 226) at proceedings against a Lollard heretic (*Chronicle of John Stone*, ed. W. G. Searle [Cambridge Antiquarian Society 34; Cambridge, 1902], pp. 108-109); J. A. F. Thomson (*The Later Lollards, 1414-1520* [Oxford, 1965], p. 182) refers to Sellyng but not to Thornden, who preached in English after the conclusion of the trial.

²⁸ See, for example, Archbishop Courtenay's statement to the Blackfriars Council in 1382 (Wilkins, *Concilia* 3.157) and his letters to Bishop Braybrooke of London (Wilkins, *Concilia* 3.158-59) and Peter Stokes at Oxford University (*Fasciculi Zizaniorum*, pp. 275-76); Courtenay's letter to Bishop Henry Wakefield in 1385 (Wilkins, *Concilia* 3.202-203) and Wakefield's letter in 1387 (*A Calendar of the Register of Henry Wakefeld Bishop of Worcester 1375-95*, ed. W. P. Maret [Worcestershire Historical Society 7; Leeds, 1972], pp. 150-52).

²⁹ The text of the conclusions is printed in *Fasciculi Zizaniorum*, pp. 360-69, and in A. Hudson, *Selections from English Wycliffite Writings* (Cambridge, 1978), pp. 24-29 (text); pp. 150-55 (commentary and notes).

³⁰ Dymmok, *Liber contra xii errores*, pp. 27-28.

heretics referred to 'insurrections' which would leave the kingdom 'desolate and destroyed'.³¹

It was also in the aftermath of the events of 1395 that ecclesiastical officials emphasized the connection between the Church's financial support of the crown and royal action against the Lollards. For instance, the Canterbury convocation urged the archbishops of Canterbury and York to plead with the king for further action against this 'perfidious sect of Lollards' and coupled that appeal with a grant of a tenth willingly to be given because 'our lord the king has always been and is a gracious lord and protector of the clergy and the English Church, and especially against the sect of the Lollards'.³² In light of the Lollard calls for disendowment and Richard II's financial needs after his expedition to Ireland,³³ it may have seemed wise to stress the clergy's financial generosity and the grounds on which it would continue. In another letter, perhaps in conjunction with the king's marriage, Archbishop Arundel and the Chapter of Canterbury forcefully made the point again:

As we reflect...how by the strength of your power you made yourself a wall of protection against the attacks of the Lollards in exaltation of the catholic faith, we offer to your gracious majesty in support of your great burdens our own goods and those of the church of Canterbury which we will not withhold from you in your need.³⁴

What may have been offered in gratitude or as a subtle inducement for further royal action against the Lollards became another source of pressure on the clergy in the early years of Henry IV's reign.

It is true, of course, that Henry IV's staunch orthodoxy in religious matters and, in particular, his anxiety about the political dangers of unregulated preaching produced even greater cooperation between the crown and ecclesiastical officials.³⁵ Certainly, the events of early 1401, that is, the Canterbury convocation's trial and condemnation of the contumacious Lollard William Sawtry and parliament's concurrent enactment of the 'De heretico comburendo' statute, suggest such cooperation. In fact, the language of the statute, which refers to 'sedition' and

³¹ H. G. Richardson and G. O. Sayles, 'Parliamentary Documents from Formularies', *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research* 11 (1934) 154.

³² Wilkins, *Concilia* 3.223; see Aston, *Arundel*, p. 329 and Dahmus, *Courtenay*, p. 227.

³³ For the Duke of Gloucester's fund-raising efforts, see *Rotuli Parliamentorum*, ed. J. Strachey, 6 vols. (London, 1767), 3.329; see also McKisack, *Fourteenth Century*, pp. 472-73.

³⁴ *Litterae Cantuariensis. The Letter Books of the Monastery of Christ Church Canterbury*, ed. J. B. Sheppard, 3 vols. (RS 85; London, 1887-89), 3.49; Aston, *Arundel*, p. 331. It is curious that in her biography of Arundel, Aston cites this document and the one referred to in note 32 but omits them in her discussion of these events in 'Lollardy and Sedition'.

³⁵ See, for example, Henry's decree against unlicensed preaching (*CCR 1399-1402*, p. 185).

'insurrection', and Henry's prompt authorization of Sawtry's execution seem to be a triumph of the ecclesiastical strategy.³⁶

However, these ecclesiastical victories may have seemed less decisive in light of the new regime's financial difficulties—difficulties which must have given greater impact to calls for clerical disendowment and taxation. B. P. Wolffe has argued, for instance, that a disendowment scheme associated with Sir John Cheyne, the Speaker of the Commons, was broached in 1399.³⁷ Certainly the concern expressed in the Canterbury convocation of 1400 and the king's unusually strong avowal of his intention to protect the liberties of the Church at the opening of the 1401 parliamentary session suggest that some move against clerical possessions had been contemplated or attempted.³⁸ The chronicles and the records of convocation also suggest that threats of disendowment may well have become a means of exacting increased subsidies. For example, in October 1403 the Canterbury convocation voted the king a half-tenth (before the last payment of the previous grant had even been collected) after Archbishop Arundel, at the Worcester Council in September, had faced threats from a group of knights.³⁹ Throughout 1404, Arundel and convocation attempted to resist parliament's plans for resumption of royal lands and extension of clerical taxation; the price was additional grants, made reluctantly and only after further formal assurances of royal protection for Church liberties.⁴⁰ Once again in 1406, when Henry was forced to accept a council with broad administrative powers, the Canterbury convocation received a royal request for a grant which was followed, as E. F. Jacob notes, by a delegation of parlia-

³⁶ For the statute, see *Rot. Parl.* 3.466-67 and *Statutes of the Realm* (London, 1816), 2 Henry iv c.15; for the similar concerns about the dangers of heresy expressed by the royal emissaries and Archbishop Arundel at the beginning of the convocation and for its proceedings against Sawtry, see Wilkins *Concilia* 3.254 ff.; for the chronology of Sawtry's trial, condemnation, and execution, see Jacob, *Fifteenth Century*, p. 95. W. Stubbs (*Constitutional History of England in the Fifteenth Century*, 5th edition, 3 vols. [Oxford, 1896], 3.370) expresses puzzlement that Arundel had Sawtry executed under the royal writ, since if he had waited until the promulgation of the statute he could have done so under his own writ. In light of an ecclesiastical strategy to involve secular authority, Arundel's action seems most appropriate. For the overall significance of the statute, see Leff, *Heresy*, p. 596.

³⁷ B. P. Wolffe, *The Royal Demesne in English History. The Crown Estate in the Governance of the Realm from the Conquest to 1509* (London, 1971), pp. 76-83, and pp. 245-47 (Appendix B). For John Cheyne's career, see J. S. Roskell, *The Commons and Their Speakers in English Parliaments, 1376-1523* (Manchester, 1965), pp. 68-69, 136-37, 353-54 and 'Sir John Cheyne of Beckford', *Transactions of the Bristol and Gloucestershire Archaeological Society* 75 (1956) 43-72 (rpt. in *Parliament and Politics in Late Medieval England* [London, 1981], 2.65-94).

³⁸ Wilkins, *Concilia* 3.242; *Rot. Parl.* 3.454 (cited by Wolffe, *Royal Demesne*, p. 247).

³⁹ Wilkins, *Concilia* 3.274; *Annales Ricardi secundi et Henrici quarti in Chronica monasterii S. Albani. Johannis de Trokelowe et Henrici de Blaneфорde...*, ed. H. T. Riley (RS 28; London, 1866), pp. 373-74; A. Rogers, 'Clerical Taxation under Henry iv, 1399-1413', *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research* 46 (1973) 129.

⁴⁰ Wilkins, *Concilia* 3.279-80; see the royal proclamation in *CPR 1401-1405*, p. 309 (cited in Rogers, 'Clerical Taxation', 130).

mentary knights, among whom may well have been Sir John Cheyne, Arundel's old adversary and a member of the new council. Under what may well be considered duress, the convocation granted not only a tenth but a special subsidy from clergy not subject to the tenth.⁴¹ Clerical financial support for the crown, which had earlier been a sign of gratitude for anti-Lollard action, now seems to have become a way of staving off the disendowment threatened by the Lollards and their supporters.

Ironically, 1406 was also the year in which the ecclesiastical efforts to portray the Lollards as political subversives finally achieved theoretical success. Perhaps it was due to the boldness of the Lollard William Taylor who preached at St. Paul's Cross during the parliamentary session and advocated clerical dispossession 'by the violent rebellion of the people', according to Arundel's Register.⁴² More likely it was the emergence of the Prince of Wales into political prominence as a member of the council.⁴³ In any event, at the end of the parliamentary session of that year a petition was introduced on behalf of the Prince (for the first time) and the spiritual and temporal lords which called for a series of actions by secular authority against the Lollards, who 'have excited and moved the people to take from prelates and ministers of holy church their temporal possessions', who 'in time will likewise excite and move the people to take from temporal lords their possessions and inheritances', and who, with their allies abroad (the Scots) undermine the peace of the realm by 'saying publicly that Richard once the King of England is still alive'.⁴⁴ The petition clearly embodies the ecclesiastical argument about the subversive nature of the attack on clerical possessions, but, more important, the abstract association of Lollardy with sedition found in 'De heretico comburendo' has now become a specific charge about Lollard involvement with traitors who imperil the crown. Furthermore, as Leff points out, the measures called for make it clear that 'civil and ecclesiastical offences had thus become one in the eyes of the law', and judicial officers were given broad powers to arrest and imprison offenders and suspects.⁴⁵ With the enactment of the 'De heretico comburendo'

⁴¹ 'The Canterbury Convocation of 1406' in *Essays in Medieval History Presented to Bertie Wilkinson*, ed. T. A. Sandquist and M. R. Powicke (Toronto, 1969), p. 350.

⁴² *Registrum Archiepiscopi Thomas Arundel* (London, Lambeth Palace Library), vol. 2, fols. 118v-119r.

⁴³ J. H. Ramsay, *Lancaster and York. A Century of English History*, 2 vols. (Oxford, 1892), 1.103.

⁴⁴ *Rot. Parl.* 3.583-84.

⁴⁵ Leff, *Heresy*, p. 596. There is no record that the petition was enacted; Aston ('Lollardy and Sedition', 34) suggests it may have been a temporary measure; Stubbs offers several possible explanations for the lack of enactment (*Constitutional History* 3.371-72). The petition and the events associated with it are also discussed by C. Kightly ('The Early Lollards: A Survey of Popular Lollard Activity in England, 1382-1428' [D.Phil. Thesis, York, 1975], p. 471) who argues that the petition refers to two distinct groups: the Lollards who attack clerical temporalities and the enemies of the crown who spread rumors of Richard II. P. McNiven's *Heresy and Politics in the Reign of Henry IV. The Burning of John Badby* (Woodbridge and Wolfeboro, N.H., 1987) came to my attention after

statute, the acceptance of the subversive implications of Lollard activity, and the empowering of civil officials to take the initiative in these ecclesiastical matters, all the elements for the suppression of the Lollards by secular authorities were in place. Only the occasion and energetic royal leadership were needed.

The prospect of such leadership being exercised by Henry v might well have seemed in doubt. After all, his friendship with Sir John Oldcastle was well known, his reaction to the Disendowment Bill of 1410, the most detailed and far-reaching effort to confiscate ecclesiastical possessions, is unknown,⁴⁶ and the motives for his dramatic attempt to win the recantation of the notorious Lollard John Badby had been questioned.⁴⁷ It may well be true that 'Only gradually did Henry v become the *princeps presbiterorum*', and that '...his hand was forced by the [Oldcastle's] rebellion'.⁴⁸

Two documents issued early in Henry's reign, however, suggest that clerical influence on him was strong and that he had accepted the ecclesiastical argument about the political dangers of Lollardy. First, within days of his accession, a royal commission was sent to Edmund Stafford, Bishop of Exeter, directing him to issue a proclamation against 'satellites of Satan who preach opinions contrary to the Catholic faith and hold schools in secret and attract many of the king's lieges to them' and authorizing him to arrest and imprison them.⁴⁹ The commission itself might well be seen as a pro forma renewal of authority required at the start of a new reign; of more interest is the phrase 'satellites of Satan', a familiar epithet for the Lollards among ecclesiastical writers.⁵⁰ A few months later a writ to the sheriffs of England emphasized the political dangers the king feared. The sheriffs were ordered to warn the people about those preaching heresy, to arrest such preachers and those who harbored or favored them because they

this essay was written. While also emphasizing the two groups mentioned in the petition, he reaches conclusions similar to mine about its intent (pp. 100-102); see also the comments of J. Coleman, *Medieval Readers and Writers, 1350-1400* (New York, 1981) who stresses the political aspects of the controversy, pp. 209-218, especially page 218.

⁴⁶ Latin versions of the bill appear in *The St. Albans Chronicle 1406-1420*, ed. V. H. Galbraith (London, 1937), pp. 52-55, and *Historia Anglicana* 2.282-84; for the English text see Hudson, *English Wycliffite Writings*, pp. 135-37; commentary and notes, pp. 203-207; see also the commentary of Hudson, *Premature Reformation*, pp. 114-15, and McNiven, *Heresy and Politics*, pp. 190-97.

⁴⁷ The most recent account and analysis of Henry's actions at Badby's execution is McNiven's (*Heresy and Politics*, pp. 209-219).

⁴⁸ Hudson, *Premature Reformation*, p. 119; McNiven, too, reflects on the reasons for Henry's development into a staunch defender of orthodoxy (*Heresy and Politics*, pp. 221-26).

⁴⁹ *CPR 1413-1416*, p. 34.

⁵⁰ See, for example, F. Taylor and J. S. Roskell, *Gesta Henrici quinti* (Oxford, 1975), p. 6; *Incerti scriptoris Chronicon*, ed. J. A. Giles (London, 1848), p. 7; *St. Albans Chronicle*, p. 78; Thomas Elmham, *Liber metricus* in *Memorials of Henry the Fifth King of England*, ed. C. A. Cole (RS 11; London, 1858), p. 99 (the Introduction to Capitulum 8 and line 127); for a discussion of clerical influence on Henry v, see J. H. Wylie, *The Reign of Henry the Fifth* 1 (Cambridge, 1914), pp. 236-41.

sow discord among the people...and a number of the people under colour of listening to such preaching have assembled there in great multitude, whence have arisen, and are like to arise murmurings and seditions to the no small disturbance of the peace unless a remedy be applied for destruction of such assemblies.⁵¹

In the light of these documents, it is hardly surprising that Henry moved swiftly and efficiently to suppress Oldcastle's uprising in 1414. The details of that affair need not be repeated here,⁵² but the measures adopted in its aftermath by the Leicester parliament demonstrate how far secular authority had taken charge of dealing with Lollardy. First, all government officials, beginning with the Chancellor, were required to swear an oath to destroy all kinds of heresies and errors called 'lollardries'; Justices of the King's Bench, of Assizes, and of the Peace were empowered to make inquiries and to issue writs for the arrest of those accused of heresy, for their supporters, and for those involved with their schools, conventicles, and writings. Once apprehended, the accused were first to be tried for any secular crimes with which they had been charged; then they were to be handed over to ecclesiastical officials for trial on religious matters.⁵³ It is true that the statute speaks of secular officials 'assisting the ordinaries' and asserts that only ecclesiastical officials have the expertise to determine heresy; however, in terms of initiative and extent of power, the primacy of authority is clear. Ecclesiastical officials have a clearly defined, but restricted, function, one which almost seems to have been assigned to them by the statute.

The rationale for the Leicester statute is clearly stated in the hearings of those arrested in Oldcastle's uprising:

[These Lollards] have for a long time boldly held various heretical views contrary to the catholic faith and other manifest errors repugnant to the catholic law, without being able to maintain the aforesaid views and errors or bring them to fulfilment in fact so long as the royal authority and the royal estate of our lord the king as well as the estate and office of the episcopal dignity continued to flourish within the realm of England.⁵⁴

As we have seen, clerical strategy had called Lollardy seditious, arguing that ecclesiastical dispossession would set off a chain reaction which would eventually undermine even the crown itself. Now, however, the Lollard threat to the crown is officially recognized to be immediate: the king will not be the last to fall, he must be the first attacked. Henry's perception of the dangers of Lollardy, an outgrowth

⁵¹ *CCR 1413-1419*, p. 86.

⁵² See, for example, Wilkins, *Concilia* 3.351-57; W. T. Waugh, 'Sir John Oldcastle', *EHR* 20 (1905) 434-56, 637-58; Wylie, *Henry the Fifth*, pp. 258-92; McFarlane, *John Wycliffe*, pp. 162-72;

⁵³ *Rot. Parl.* 4.24-25; *Statutes of the Realm*, 2 Henry v 1.c.7.

⁵⁴ G. O. Sayles, *Select Cases in the Court of King's Bench under Richard II, Henry IV, and Henry V* (Selden Society 88; London, 1971), p. 218.

of ecclesiastical strategy and Oldcastle's uprising, marks the fulfillment of the Church's desire to involve secular authority in combatting the heresy; but the consequence was the passing of initiative to the monarchy, even in ecclesiastical matters.

II

Against the background of this protracted political struggle between orthodox ecclesiastical officials and the Lollards, we can turn first to the sermons of Thomas Brinton written in the 1370's and early 1380's, and then to those of his Benedictine confrere, the anonymous preacher of Bodley 649, written approximately thirty years later. As we would expect, there is a high degree of consistency in fundamentals of dogma and morality — a consistency which makes changes in their political views more noticeable. I will consider their views on the misfortunes which had recently befallen England, the causes of them, and the remedies which were required, or had been applied, for the kingdom's rejuvenation.

In the 1370's, after many years of harmony at home and triumph abroad, England had fallen from divine favor, according to Bishop Brinton:

In the time of our king [Edward III], England was called, in the manner of Rome, the kingdom of kingdoms because it won so many victories, captured so many kings, and occupied so many domains.... But I am fearful that because of our sins every part of our kingdom falls and collapses, and God, who was accustomed to be English, abandons us.⁵⁵

At home natural disaster, immorality, and lawlessness prevailed:

In England there is much loss of crops and cruel pestilence, much injustice and many false masters, so much luxury and adultery that few men are content with their own wives....⁵⁶ In England there are many laws, but there is no observance or enforcement of them. Clearly, unless this lawlessness, injustice, and immorality are quickly checked by enforcing the laws, the kingdom will be destroyed or at least transformed.⁵⁷

Abroad, earlier military success had gone sour:

...so great is our pride and arrogance that we attack all earthly kingdoms. We should not be surprised that they rise up and attack us. We struggle for much, but we hold

⁵⁵ Brinton, p. 47; all quotations are my translations from Devlin's edition. For a discussion of patriotic support for, as well as criticism of, war in fourteenth-century England, see J. Barnie, *War in Medieval Society. Social Values and the Hundred Years War 1337-99* (London, 1974), pp. 97-138. For a brief history of the use of religious imagery to express English nationalism, see J. W. McKenna, 'How God Became an Englishman' in *Tudor Rule and Revolution. Essays for G. R. Elton from his American Friends*, ed. D. J. Guth and J. W. McKenna (Cambridge, 1982), pp. 25-43.

⁵⁶ Brinton, p. 216; repeated on pp. 245, 318.

⁵⁷ Brinton, p. 390.

on to little. Our enemies speak the truth about us: we are bold to attack but careless about future dangers. They claim that the cause of our recent defeats is this: we do not honor God for the gracious victories which he has given us. Instead we ascribe them to our own courage and warlike skill. We shall be deprived of just as much honor as we rightly owe to God.⁵⁸

As even these brief citations make clear, Brinton placed the blame for England's misfortunes directly on the sinfulness of people. Any attempt to escape guilt brought a stern rejoinder.

Behold, how marvelous it is that if some grave danger should appear to threaten—if, for instance, good weather turn stormy, if peace turn to war, if fertile land turn arid, if animals die or people be struck with pestilence—all these kinds of things are attributed to the reign of Saturn or other planets. But I attribute them entirely to our sinfulness, for scripture says, 'Rightly we suffer, for we have sinned.' For what planet was reigning in the time of Noah when all but eight souls drowned in the flood waters? Surely it was the planet of wickedness and sin.... And what planet reigned at the burning of Sodom except wickedness and sin.... No, dearly beloved, more praiseworthy is the person who sees his own failings than he who, not seeing or recognizing them, knows all about the motion of the stars or the natural cycles on earth; no, the punishment of God should not be attributed to the planets or elements but to our own sins.⁵⁹

Brinton summarized this traditional Christian moral judgment on the events of history succinctly: 'If men were good, the times would be good.'⁶⁰

But Brinton's belief in the traditional tripartite model of society, with its hierarchical organization and distinct but interdependent functions, also impelled him to concentrate his criticism on those 'estates' whom he considered most responsible for England's plight.⁶¹ First, the magnates of the realm:

But greater are the sins of the wealthy and the magnates than of the commons or the poor. For while the commons usually live honestly of their own, the magnates usually live from others through violence and seizures, through taxation and extortion, fraudulent deeds and extravagant expenses, so much so that those who ought to be richer are left, through their bad management, poorer.⁶²

⁵⁸ Brinton, p. 48.

⁵⁹ Brinton, pp. 202-203; see also page 198.

⁶⁰ Brinton, p. 77. Brinton, of course, is hardly unique in expressing such views. For example, his confrere and fellow preacher Rypon attributes present evils to sin (fols. 34r, 57v, 165r; even military defeat, fol. 122r). Among the chroniclers, Walsingham, *Historia anglicana* 1.453, 459 (on sin as the cause of the Peasants Revolt); among the poets, John Gower, *Vox clamantis* in *The Complete Works of John Gower*, ed. G. C. Macaulay, 4 vols. (Oxford, 1902), 4.308-312, lines 1400-20; 'On the Times' in *Political Poems and Songs*, ed. T. Wright, 2 vols. (RS 14; London, 1859-61), 1.270.

⁶¹ For a general discussion of the three estates, see R. Mohl, *The Three Estates in Medieval and Renaissance Literature* (New York, 1933).

⁶² Brinton, p. 320; see also page 138.

These same magnates also quarrelled frequently with the Church, undermining her authority and the good order of the kingdom.

Nowadays these temporal lords, in order to find the means of resisting ecclesiastical criticism—no matter how reasonable and just—and to avoid the warnings and good counsel of their bishops, pile up for themselves extraordinary masters who tickle their ears, through whose questionable doctrines various errors are sown among the people; so much so that if laymen attempt against the liberty of the Church a scandalous deed reproved by all and universally condemned, these same extraordinary doctors, against good conscience and justice, color, approve, and justify the same deed. Therefore, many misfortunes befall the kingdom in these days. The Church which ought to be lord is crushed for the moment, knights are stirred up against the clergy, just law is turned against itself, reason sleeps, justice is oppressed, and equity buried.⁶³

The tone of Brinton's words suggests that he was alluding here to specific contentious events which had aroused strong passions. His anger at a 'factum horribile' committed by laymen against the liberty of the Church and his derisive dismissal of the 'doctores extraordinarii' who had defended it may well refer to the Haulay/Shakyl affair and Wyclif's role in justifying it (see p. 194 above).⁶⁴

But Brinton's anger with the magnates and their divisive advisors did not blind him to the faults of ecclesiastical leaders.

Do we not see that those raised to honor in the Church are more interested in their own glory than in God's or the Church's. Surely there are many who when they are elevated to the Church's honors or endowed with great benefices are single-minded in repairing their buildings and expanding their holdings, but little or nothing do they do to increase the honor of God.⁶⁵

More important, too many ecclesiastics, who should have been the outspoken, independent voices of Christian morality, had acquiesced to evil and to attacks on the Church.

...we prelates, curates, and confessors, who ought freely to speak the truth and to give our lives in protecting the rights of the Church, although we see the kingdom badly led and the Church enslaved more than in the time of Pharaoh who took no heed of God's law, although we hear and know that scandalous fornication, incest and adultery, usury and simony vilely defame and pollute the kingdom and the church, nevertheless we, who hold the places of apostles and disciples of Christ, do not dare open our mouths to excise or correct them.⁶⁶

⁶³ *Brinton*, pp. 387-88.

⁶⁴ For comments on the dating of this sermon, see *Brinton*, p. xxx.

⁶⁵ *Brinton*, p. 5; see also page 57.

⁶⁶ *Brinton*, p. 277; similarly, p. 246. For similar views, see Rypon, fols. 111r, 194r, and several other examples cited in Owst, *Literature and Pulpit*, pp. 70-71, 269-70; *Historia anglicana* 1.356; *Chronicon Angliae*, p. 104.

Because of this negligence, they had forfeited their privileged positions as the guiding 'stars' of virtuous living.⁶⁷

To remedy England's condition, Brinton proposed, quite naturally, moral conversion within each estate. But, true to his belief in a hierarchical social structure, he placed the greatest burden on the clergy, especially the prelates. Again and again he called on them to abandon comfortable benefices and return to the guardianship of their flocks. Once they had reformed their own lives, they would be able to reassert their moral authority by condemning the vices of the rich as well as the poor and by defending vigorously the rights of the Church. Again and again, using his favorite image, he called on them once more to be the strong pillars ('columpne') who 'carry the Church on their shoulders and give their lives for her liberties'.⁶⁸ 'Indeed if with courage and unity we [prelates] stand as we ought, among temporal lords, clerics, and people we would be held in the highest reverence and honor',⁶⁹ and with this renewed prestige as wise counselors they might guide the moral rejuvenation of the kingdom.

And what of Wyclif and the Lollards? Explicit references appear only in Brinton's last few sermons, after Wyclif in the late 1370's had made explicit his radical position on priestly power and the sacraments, especially the Eucharist. For instance, in two sermons, probably from the time of the Blackfriars Council, Brinton briefly listed and refuted three of Wyclif's errors on the sacraments.⁷⁰ These few references should not lead us to conclude that he had underestimated the significance of the Wycliffites. In those sermons he identified them as false prophets ('pseudoprophete') whose appearance, predicted in the gospel narratives, heralded the apocalyptic last times.⁷¹ He saw them not as a sudden, unexpected phenomenon, but as the inevitable sign of the end of a long process of moral decay—not a cause, but a result of pervasive sinfulness in England. Despite the political dangers they posed and the religious doctrines they imperiled, Wyclif and his followers were still only a manifestation of mankind's perennial struggle against the sinful tendencies of the human heart.

⁶⁷ Brinton, p. 147; in the same passage Brinton compares the Pope and the emperor to the sun and the moon respectively, an analogy which indicates how similar his view on the matter is to that of Uthred of Boldon discussed earlier.

⁶⁸ Brinton, pp. 70, 113, 167, 242, 317. For the use of this imagery elsewhere, see, for example, Gregory xi's condemnation of Wyclif in 1377 (Wilkins, *Concilia* 3.116), and the letter of the Oxford judges appointed to examine Wycliffite books in 1382 (Wilkins, *Concilia* 3.171).

⁶⁹ Brinton, pp. 52, 70.

⁷⁰ Brinton, pp. 466, 495-96.

⁷¹ Brinton, pp. 466, 495; Rypon also sees them as false preachers heralding the end of the world (fol. 40r).

III

The anonymous Benedictine preacher in Bodley 649 fundamentally shared Bishop Brinton's outlook on the moral nature of the universe. In his unusual macaronic way,⁷² for instance, he used the imagery of the wheel of fortune and the 'ubi sunt' motif to create a nostalgic lament for the kingdom of England ravaged by the effects of sin:

Vbi, queso, fuit aliquod regnum qwirliid alcius super rotam honoris quam istud fuit?... Omnia Cristiana regna venerabantur et timebant [Anglicos] in tantum quo modicum penon vnus Anglici militis schuld afrayt in campo totum exercitum regni. A Domine Deus, vbi est mirthis et gloriam istius terre becum? Vbi est þe welth and prosperite que olim fuerant in isto regno? Certe it is vanschit away. Fortuna nostra mutatur, rota honoris vertitur vpsodon.... / Et que est causa, creditis? Certe, non respicimus versus Dominum nostrum vt deberemus.... Quamdiu ereximus oculum et cordialem amorem versus Dominum, tamdiu rota nostri honoris rotauit versus sursum, tamdiu Deus misit nobis gratiam et copiam bonorum, requiem et pacem inter nos[metipsos], et victoriam de nostris inimicis. Et quam cito assiduus respeximus ipsum et dileximus, quam cito creuimus in virtute, tanto alcius we clombe super illam [rotam], magis creuit our welth et noster honor. Sed exquo dedimus nos peccatis, relinquimus virtutem et Dominum rectem. Sicut amor slakid, sic slakid noster honor.⁷³

But while this acknowledgment of general sinfulness, and the accompanying call for personal conversion, appeared throughout, it was overshadowed by the preacher's vehement denunciations of Lollardy. For instance, a few sentences after the passage just cited, the preacher attributed the slackening of love and the 'wagging' (wavering) of the 'pillar of faith' ('columpna fidei') to the 'cursed storm

⁷² For a discussion of the types of macaronic structure, see S. Wenzel's unpublished paper, 'Macaronic Sermons in Medieval England—Some Observations', given at the Medieval Sermon Studies Symposium (Oxford, July 1982) and summarized in the *Medieval Sermon Studies Newsletter. Report of the 1982 Symposium*, pp. 3-4. As an illustration of the structure, the first quotation is cited as it appears in the manuscript (with a modernized English version in the note). Subsequent quotations have been translated and modernized in the text with the original supplied in the notes; phrases and brief passages are given in modern translation with folio references in parentheses.

⁷³ 'Where, I ask, was any kingdom whirled higher on the wheel of fortune than this one was?... All Christian kingdoms honored and feared us so much that a small pennant of one English soldier in the field would frighten a kingdom's entire army. Ah, Lord God, where has the mirth and glory of this land gone? Where is the wealth and prosperity which were once in this kingdom? Surely, it has vanished. Our fortune changes, the wheel of honor turns upside down.... / And what is the cause, do you think? Clearly, we do not look toward our Lord as we ought.... As long as we lifted eye and heart-felt love toward the Lord, so long did the wheel of our honor move upward, so long did God send us grace and abundant good, rest and peace among ourselves, and victory over our enemies. And as soon as we were careful to respect and love him, as soon as we grew in virtue, so much higher did we climb on that [wheel], the more our wealth and honor increased. But as soon as we turned to sin we lost virtue and the rightful Lord. As our love slackened so did our honor' (fols. 69v-70r).

of lollardy' (fol. 70v). Again and again he castigated the heresy as the 'foundation of perversity' (fol. 10v), 'the venomous serpent of hell' (fol. 55r), and 'the devil's chief messenger' (fol. 16r) which 'since the time of Wiclif' (fol. 34r) had been the principal cause of England's travail. At one point, in a tone of despair, he cried out, 'Who, I ask, has ever thrown the city of God into more confusion than these Lollards who have overwhelmed the people of God' (fol. 12v).⁷⁴

Among the harmful results of the Lollard presence, the preacher took particular note of England's military and political danger. In times past, virtue had been rewarded by victory over the kingdom's enemies, but 'as soon as the sect of Lollards increased in the kingdom, honor began to wane, shame to grow, subjects became rebellious, enemies became bold' (fol. 55r). Once-powerful England which had not been disturbed by 'Scottish mists' or 'French showers' (fol. 71r) was now shaken by 'a little wind from Wales' (fol. 55r).⁷⁵ For the preacher, as for the sponsors of the parliamentary petition of 1406, the rise of political unrest at home and military pressure from abroad coincided with the flourishing activities of these seditious elements.⁷⁶

So pernicious had the Lollards become that only strong measures would rescue England from them. For example, the preacher likened them twice to Achan who desecrated Josue's victory at Jericho by stealing gold designated for the temple of the Lord (Ios 7).

I dare to say that never will there be rest nor peace in this kingdom, nor will we ever succeed in earthly or spiritual battle until this spoil is burned, until these thieves leave their sins and burn these things with the fire of contrition; or, if they remain obstinate in their evil, [two or three words erased in the manuscript] as an example for others as was their father Achor.

Surely, unless the sons of Achor, that is these Lollards and proud ones, are stoned as Achor was, unless they confess their evil and destroy their sins with the hard rocks

⁷⁴ The labelling of the Lollards, especially Oldcastle, as principal associates of the devil also appears in popular poetry. See, for instance, Thomas Hoccleve's 'Address to Sir John Oldcastle, A.D. 1415' in *Hoccleve's Works: The Minor Poems*, ed. F. J. Furnivall and I. Gollancz (EETS ES 61, 73; London, 1892, 1925); revised by J. Mitchell and A. I. Doyle (1970), 2.468.

⁷⁵ This may well be a reference to the rebellion of Owen Glendower; for a summary see Jacob, *Fifteenth Century*, pp. 37-66.

⁷⁶ The seditious activities of the Lollards are noted in several popular poems: 'Defend Us from All Lollardry' in *Historical Poems of the XIVth and XVth Centuries*, ed. R. H. Robbins (New York, 1959), no. 64, p. 156, lines 137-144 (see also R. H. Robbins, 'Poems on Contemporary Conditions' in the *A Manual of the Writings in Middle English*, ed. A. B. Hartung, 8 vols. [Hamden, Conn., 1967-89], 5.1452-53); Hoccleve, 'Balade, After King Richard II's Bones were Brought to Westminster, A.D. 1413', *Minor Poems*, 8.23 (see also W. Matthews, 'Thomas Hoccleve' in *A Manual* [1972], 3.753-54); 'Friar Daw's Reply' in *Jack Upland, Friar Daw's Reply and Upland's Rejoinder*, ed. P. L. Heyworth (Oxford, 1968), p. 75, lines 71-74. For commentary on these poems and the political criticism of the Lollards, see V. J. Scattergood, *Politics and Poetry in the Fifteenth Century* (London, 1971), pp. 152-57, 248-58.

of contrition and penance, never shall we have victory over our enemies or prosperity in the kingdom.⁷⁷

Of course, the preacher couched his remarks carefully, calling above all for repentance, and restricting the ideas of burning and stoning to metaphoric expressions. But the implication about the appropriate remedies against the Lollards seems plain enough.⁷⁸

To the preacher's evident admiration, Henry v had undertaken this urgent task and, with the renewal of divine favor, had restored peace and order at home and prestige abroad. The preacher celebrated the king's deeds in three traditional literary and homiletic figures—the ship of state, the pillar (or column) of the temple, and the *miles dei*. His unusual variations on these familiar figures suggest how much the exigencies of the Lollard controversy had affected ecclesiastical perceptions of the Church's own power and of its relationship to royal power. The symbolic ship of state appears as a topos in three sermons.⁷⁹ In each case, the preacher (1) identified the three parts of the English vessel, (2) described how it had once dominated the other 'craft' at sea, and (3) lamented its recent misfortunes and their causes.⁸⁰

⁷⁷ 'Audeo dicere que numquam erit requies nec pax in isto regno, nec bene expediemus in bello corporali nec spiritali donec istud spoliū comburatur, donec hii fures relinquant peccata et ea comburant contricionis igne, aut si obstinati fuerint in malicia [erasure] ad exemplum aliorum sicut pater eorum Achor' (fol. 13r). 'Quia certe, nisi filii Achor, id est isti Lollardi et superbi, lapidentur sicut Achor fuerat, nisi confessi fuerint a trespas et delectant sua peccata duris lapidibus contricionis et penitentie, numquam habebimus victoriam de inimicis nec prosperitatem in regno' (fol. 103r).

It seems particularly appropriate for a Benedictine (a 'possessor'') to associate the Lollards with the thief Achan who stole treasure consecrated to God; the association is also made in 'Friar Daw's Reply', p. 73, lines 23-24.

⁷⁸ A similar view is more explicitly expressed in a sermon from Oxford, Bodleian Library Laud Misc. 706: '[These Lollards should be] hangud for false treson that they wolde haue in gouernynge of temperlre and brend for makynge of her sacrifice the sencers of spiritalte' (fol. 104v). For further anti-Lollard comments in the sermons of this manuscript and its connections to the Benedictines, see Horner, 'Benedictines and Preaching', 318-319.

⁷⁹ For homiletic use of the ship image, see the examples cited in Owst, *Literature and Pulpit*, pp. 67-76; poetic examples include 'On the Death of Edward III' in Wright, *Political Poems* 1.215-18; 'The Ship of State (1458)' in Robbins, *Historical Poems*, no. 78, pp. 191-93 (in the notes to which Robbins lists other poetic examples); see also *Manual* 5.1477.

⁸⁰ The methodology of my analysis assumes a chronological arrangement of the sermons in the manuscript. I argue that the second and third examples of the ship topos, in which the preacher moves from conventional moralizing to pointed comments about specific events during the Lollard controversy, reflect his growing sense of the danger posed by the heretics over a period of time. I have cited the sermons in the order in which they appear in the manuscript, but the only internal evidence that this order is chronological is a reference in one sermon ('Intrauit castellum', fol. 124r) to an earlier one ('Statuit eum supra pinnaculum templi', fol. 112v) in which the preacher, or scribe, notes that the same material has appeared before ('sic incipit Statuit eum supra pinnaculum templi' [theme underlined in the manuscript], fol. 128r). Despite this limited evidence, I believe it to be probable that the preacher would move from the traditional and more general use of the topos to the

(1) In the turbulent sea of this world sailed the ship of our kingdom which was made of three parts: the forecastle is the clergy—prelates, rectors, presbyters, and other ministers of holy church in their proper stations; the hindcastle is the barons—the king with his princes; and the body is the commons—artisans and merchants, tradesmen and farmers.⁸¹ (2) This was once a beautiful and strong ship, so strong that the great cog of France and Normandy did not dare to look at it; the swift galley of Spain, if it saw it on the sea, wished to flee and head to shore; the strong carrack of Scotland as far as they might see her wished to strike sail and surrender. All Christian kingdoms feared and honored the English because of the courage and good governance that was found among us. (3) But, alas, our noble ship began to grow so weak and to be held in such little esteem among our enemies that a small fishing boat [blank space in the manuscript; in the third example given below 'of Wales' appears] tries to oversail us. And truly, it is no surprise because the forecastle is almost submerged in the whirlpool of greed and sinful gain, the hindcastle is hurled about by the winds of pride and high bearing, and the body of the ship is nearly overwhelmed with the waves of luxury, lust, and desire.⁸²

This example is the preacher's most traditional use of the topos in which he, like Bishop Brinton, attributed the foundering of the English ship to pervasive sinfulness, especially among the clergy and nobility.

In another example, (based on Lc 8:22-25: Christ asleep in the boat during the storm), the preacher reiterated the first part of the topos almost verbatim, but then

more original and specific, adding further allusions and assigning greater responsibility to the Lollards as he perceived the threat from them increasing.

⁸¹ In the call for prayer which concludes the prothemes of two other sermons, the preacher made clear the proper function of each social group (estate) in the ship: 'In ista prece habebitis recomendatos nostre naus gubernatores, deuotum clerum; naus defensores, ꝑe manful miliciam; remiges et ministros infra naui, fidelem communitatem' (fols. 61r, 112v). The preacher reiterated the point later in one of these sermons by noting that the devil was so angered at the good sailing of the English ship that he sent the Lollards to attack the helmsmen, the clergy (fol. 63v). However, the topos is not used uniformly: in 'On the Death of Edward III' (Wright, *Political Poems* 1.215-18), there is no mention of the clergy among the estates of the realm and the king is the 'gubernaculum' ('rudder', line 57), as is Henry IV in the message delivered by royal emissaries to the Canterbury convocation of 1411 (Wilkins, *Concilia* 3.334).

⁸² 'In hoc turbilento mari istius mundi seylyt naus nostri regni que fuit ex tribus partibus: anterior pars est clerus—prelati, rectores et presbiteri, et alii ministri ecclesie sancte in illorum gradu; posterior pars est baronia—rex cum proceribus; et corpus naus est communitas—artifices et mercatores, opera[r]ii et agricultores. Ista fuit olim pulcra naus et fortis, adeo fortis que magna keg Francie et Normandie non audebant ipsam expectare; velox galie Hispanie, si vidisset ipsam super mare, vellet fugere et declinare ad litum, fortis kraire Scocie tam procul vt possent eam videre, vellent strike sail et exhibere sibi honorem. Omnia Cristiana regna olim timebant et venerabantur Anglicos propter fortitudinem et bonam gubernacionem que fuerat inter ipsos. Sed pro dolor nostra nobilis naus incipit iam esse adeo debilis et tam modice reputacionis inter inimicos nostros que modica fischeris bote [space left blank] nititur super velificare nos. Et vere non mirum quia anterior pars fere submergitur in voragine auaricie and in synful wynnynge, pars posterior is al to hurlid vento superbie and of hy beringe, et corpus naus is neze ouerwelmyt with ꝑe wawis luxurie of lustis and of likinge' (fol. 22r).

made his account of England's misfortunes much more specific, shifting his emphasis from moral concerns—the sinfulness of all—to political disputes, in which he assigned particular culpability to the Lollards.

(1 and 2) The ship of us all is this kingdom, the kingdom of England.... Once all Christian kingdoms feared and honored the English because of the courage, good discipline, and virtuous life that was among them. (3) But, alas, our ship is so weak, our enemies give so little heed to us that a little fishing boat is accustomed to oversail us. And why is this, do you think? Surely, / because Christ sleeps, Christ because of the evil life, pomp and pride, and the false belief that is among us, withdrew his grace from us.... And while Christ sleeps so, our ship has been so tossed about in many storms that it was on the point of perishing and was often in great danger: when the commons rose against the nobles it was in great danger; when the nobles quarreled among themselves it was in great danger; for the greater part of our lives, as you know, never in greater danger than it is this day, as I believe, because of the dissension and debate between God and ourselves on account of the false belief and the false Lollardy among us. These cursed Lollards strive to subvert our faith and destroy holy church which is the first part of our ship. And who, I ask, is able to save our ship if the first part be destroyed? This storm of Lollardy has grown so much that the English ship is almost ruled by the waves of false belief. In whatever province, in whatever shire of England there are certain ones of this sect, many waver in faith, as many men as women, as many learned as lay....⁸³

Then, in the third case, after a similar opening, he added further allusions to more recent political events and recounted how the foundering kingdom had been righted by Henry v.

(1 and 2) The great ship which sailed for many days in the sea of prosperity is this abundant kingdom, the kingdom of England.... Once all Christian kingdoms feared and honored the English because of the courage, good order, and / virtuous life that

⁸³ *Navis omnium nostrum est istud regnum, regnum Anglie.... Omnia Cristiana regna olim timebant et venerabantur Anglicos propter fortitudinem, bonum regimen, et bonam vitam que erat inter ipsos.... Sed prodolor, navis nostra est iam adeo debilis, adeo modicum nostri inimici curant de nobis que modica fischeris naucula utatur to ouerseil vs. Et quare est hoc, creditis? Certe / quia Cristus dormit, Cristus propter malam vitam pompam et superbiam et falsam fidem que est inter nos subtraxit gratiam suam a nobis.... Et dum Cristus ita dormiunt, navis nostra hath so hurlid and burlid tempestatibus diuersis quod fuit in puncto pereundi et hoc frequenter fuit in magno periculo: quando communitas surrexit contra dominos fuit eciam in grandi periculo [Peasants' Revolt of 1381]; quando domini dissenciebant inter se fuit in grandi periculo [Lord Appellants controversy of 1386-88]; per maiorem partem nostrorum dierum, vt nouistis omnes, sed in maiori periculo quam est ista die numquam fuit sicut ego credo. Quia iam dissensio and debate inter Deum et nos, pro falsa fide et falsa Lollardria que est inter nos. Isti execrati Lollardi nituntur subuertere fidem nostram et destruere sanctam ecclesiam que est prima pars nostre navis. Et quis, rogo, potest saluare nostram nauem si prima pars destruat? Ista tempestas Lollardrie adeo creuit que navis Anglie fere operitur fluctibus fidei peruerse. In qualibet prouincia, in qualibet schira Anglie sunt quedam de ista secta, plurimi vacillant in fide, tam mares quam femine tam eruditi quam laici...' (fols. 97r-v).*

was among us. While our ship was steered by the rudder of virtue, we sailed the sea of wealth and prosperity. Fortune was our friend. Our honor grew. (3) But as soon as virtue ceased and vice began to rule, fortune turned her face, our honor began to wane. Our ship was so feeble, so little did our enemies think of us that the little fishing boat of Wales was on the point of oversailing us. Thus through pride and sin we sailed from prosperity into woe. There was much woe and hardship in this kingdom; because of sin many misfortunes mounted up among us, the storms of debate and dissension blew up fast. Our ship was so tossed among the waves and swells that it was in great danger and often on the point of perishing. It was in great danger when the commons rose against the nobles. It was in great danger when the nobles argued among themselves. It was in great danger at the sharp shower of Salop. It was in great danger when the Lollards rebelled and rose against God and king to have destroyed him and holy church. Our ship was in such danger that, unless our gracious king had set his hand on the rudder and steered our ship through the storm, it had easily gone all to wreck.⁸⁴

The preacher, of course, applauded Henry's actions, and the remainder of the sermon is a panegyric on his rejuvenation of religious fervor at home and military success abroad. However, the consequences of the king's success must also be recognized. The position of the clergy has been diminished. Henry has taken the rudder ('raper'); the king, not the prelates, is now the helmsman ('gubernator') of the English ship of state.

When we turn to the figure of the pillar (or column) of the temple the matter is more complex. We have already noted that Brinton's sermons and several ecclesiastical documents from the earlier years of the Wycliffite controversy describe the clergy as the 'columnae' of the Church or of the Christian faith.⁸⁵ But

⁸⁴ 'Magna nauis que nauigauit multis diebus in mari prosperitatis est illud copiosum regnum, regnum Anglie.... Omnia Cristiana regna olim timebant et honorabant Anglicos propter eorum fortitudinem, bonum regimen, et / bonam vitam que erat inter illos. Dum nostra nauis was stirid gubernaculo virtutis, nauigaumus mare of welth et prosperitatis. Fortuna was oure frend. Noster creuit honor. Sed statim ut virtus cessauit et vicia ceperunt regnare, fortuna mutauit vultum, noster honor cepit decrescere. Nostra nauis was so feble, so litel oure emnys set of us quod þe litel fischeres bote of Wales fuit in puncto to ouerseile vs. þus þoroo pride and synne a prosperitate nauigaumus into wo. Mech wo and tribulacion fuit in hoc regno, for synne mani mishappis mownt up inter nos, stormes of debate and dissencion piryd up fast. Nostra nauis was so hurlid and burlid inter ventos et freta quod erat in grandi periculo et sepe in puncto pereundi. Fuit in grandi periculo quando communes surrexerunt contra dominos. Fuit eciam in grandi periculo quando domini litigabant inter se. Fuit in grandi periculo at þe scharp schowre Salopie [The Earl of Northumberland's rebellion put down at Shrewsbury in 1403]. Fuit eciam in grandi periculo quando Lollardi rebellabant et surrexerunt contra Deum et regem to a distroyed him and holichirch. Nostra nauis fuit in tanto periculo quod nisi noster graciosus rex set honde on þe raper and stirid nostram nauem tempestivius, nostra nauis had schaplich to a go al to wreke' (fols. 129v-130r).

⁸⁵ The image is also used in popular poetry: Hoccleve calls Henry v the 'piler of our feith' in his 'Balade au tres noble Roy Henry le Quint' (*Minor Poems* 5.13); the 'Epitaph for the Duke of Gloucester (1447)' lauds Humphrey as 'of thy chirche the myghti pilier stronge' (Robbins, *Historical*

the temple as a figure of the Church also appeared in the writings of Wyclif and his followers who, citing the gospel narratives of Christ cleansing the temple (Mt 21:12-13; Mc 11:11, 15-19; Lc 19:45-48; and Jo 2:13-17), called for the restoration of sacred space in God's house by purifying those who served there. For instance, Wyclif himself in a section of *De civili dominio* argued that Christ's expulsion of the 'buyers and sellers' justified the efforts of the king and secular nobles to remove temporal endowments from the clergy who abused them:

Christus ut rex ascendens Jerusalem primo omnium rectificavit templum eiciendo ementes et vendentes, ut patet Math. xxi, ut sepe exposui, exemplificavit in hoc regibus et dominis secularibus ut ipsi vadant et faciant similiter.⁸⁶

Similarly, the homily on the Gospel for the tenth Sunday after Trinity (Lc 19:45-48) in the Wycliffite cycle described how Christ had purged the sanctuary of priests and clerks whose greatest sin was the possession of unneeded temporal goods.⁸⁷ In Wycliffite thought, then, cleansing the temple is associated with ridding the clergy of these temporal possessions. But the Wycliffites depicted those who possessed such goods (originally the friars, but by extension other clergy as well) as builders and occupants of 'Caym's castles' which must be destroyed.⁸⁸ And so, in the polemics of Lollard debate, the figures of the pillar (column) and the castle, the symbolic action of cleansing the temple, and the contention over the temporal possessions of the clergy were interrelated. Since, of course, the leader of the 1414 Lollard uprising was Sir John Oldcastle, it is hardly surprising that our preacher put this cluster of figures and themes to good use.⁸⁹

Poems, no. 73, line 81, p. 183) for his efforts against the Lollards; see also Scattergood, *Politics and Poetry*, p. 157.

⁸⁶ *De civili dominio* IV, ed. J. Loserth (London, 1904), p. 457; see also 'De paupertate Christi' in *Opera minora*, p. 62.

⁸⁷ A. Hudson, *English Wycliffite Sermons* (Oxford, 1983), pp. 260-63; see also J. H. Todd, *An Apology for Lollard Doctrines, Attributed to Wycliffe* (Camden Society 20; London, 1842), pp. 57-58.

⁸⁸ Margaret Aston cites several uses of the phrase in Wyclif ("Caim's Castles": Poverty, Politics and Disendowment' in Dobson, *Church, Politics and Patronage*, pp. 45-81); to those can be added several from Wycliffite tracts in English, some found in *The English Works of Wyclif Hitherto Unprinted*, ed. F. D. Matthew (EETS OS 74; London, 1880): 'Of Clerks Possessioners' (p. 129), 'How Satan and his Children...' (p. 211), 'De officio pastoralis' (pp. 420, 425, 448, 449), 'De Papa' (p. 478), and a note on the term (p. 508). Others are in T. Arnold, *Select English Works of Wyclif* 3 (Oxford, 1871): 'Vita sacerdotum' (p. 241), 'The Church and Her Members' (p. 348), 'Fifty Errors and Heresies of Friars' (p. 368). Ironically, Uthred of Boldon predates Wyclif and his followers in associating the friars with the descendants of Cain in his treatise *Contra querelas fratrum* (London, British Library Royal 6.D.x, fols. 283r-285r); see Szittyá, *Antifraternal Tradition*, pp. 110-11. For the use of the castle or fortress in sermon literature, see Owst, *Literature and Pulpit*, pp. 77-85.

⁸⁹ The pun on Oldcastle's name is also used in popular poetry: 'Defend Us from All Lollardry' (Robbins, *Historical Poems*, no. 64, line 33); 'Against the Lollards' (Wright, *Political Poems* 2.243-47, lines 33-72).

Once again, as with the ship topos, the preacher's use of the figures changed in the course of several sermons. In one case he described how the Lollards had first attacked the clergy, especially the 'poor friars' and the 'pillar of the possessioners', and then the king himself, who with God's aid defeated them:

First these Lollards shot many vicious words at the poor friars; they derided their poverty and the order which the church approves, in which there are many clerics and good men. Next they cast a mine under the pillar of the possessioners; they dug deeply for the treasure of the church. They set up ways for temporal hands to seize our sustenance. They did not weigh heavily excommunication or church censure.... They became so old and foolhardy that they rose against our king to destroy him. But the God of kindness and mercy, seeing the sobbing and sorrows, the tears and prayers of the church, sent to comfort us all a heavenly warrior, clothed in white, armored in gold, and brandishing a lance in his hand. This heavenly knight is he who lives on high, our liege lord the king whom God sent in defense of the church and the salvation of the whole kingdom.⁹⁰

In another sermon, on the theme 'Statuit eum pinnaculum templi', he made no mention of the column of the possessioners, emphasizing instead the 'castle' built by the Lollards. Although impregnable in outward appearance, it was without strong foundation, and fell quickly—once again to Henry's attack.

By the castle which was unsteady and not able to stand, I understand the castle of the infernal demon, Oldcastle and his sect who were joined and united in evil against the lord God, against our gracious king, and the ministers of the church. The strength of this camp terrified many boldhearted men. It grew to be so large and strong within a short time that, unless the soldier of God, our liege lord who now is, had attacked and besieged it manfully, in human estimate it was most unlikely to have been conquered.⁹¹

⁹⁰ 'Primo isti Lollardi sagittauerunt plura praua verba ad pauperes fratres; deprauarunt eorum pauperiem et ordinem quos ecclesia approbat, in quo plures magni clerici et boni viri sunt. Deinde p[er] caston a myn ad columpnam pocessionibus [sic], profunde foderunt pro thesauro ecclesie, fecerunt media ad temporalem manum ad capiendum nostras possessiones. Ultra vires laborabant ad rapiendum nostrum victum. Non ponderabant excommunicationem aut censuras ecclesie.... Adeo ceperunt esse bold and fulhardy que insurrexerunt contra dominum nostrum regem ad destruendum eum.... Sed Deus pietatis et misericordie videns singultus et dolores, lacrimas et preces ecclesie in grande confortacionem omnium nostrum misit nobis celestem militem albis indutum armis, aureis armatum et lanceam in manu vibrantem. Iste celestis miles est qui celice viuuit, ligius dominus noster rex quem Deus misit nobis in defensione ecclesie et saluacionem tocius regni' (fol. 35r). Although this passage does not mention Oldcastle, a marginal note explains that the 'miles celestis'... 'iustid' ('jousted') with and overturned the 'vetus castrum diaboli' (fol. 35v).

⁹¹ 'Per castellum quod erat infiendo et non potuit stare, intelligo castellum demonis inferni, Oldcastel et eius sectam qui erant connexi et confederati in malicia contra dominum Deum, contra gracious regem nostrum, et ministerios ecclesie. Fortitudo huius castri terruit plures boldhertid men. Cepit esse adeo grande et forte infra modicum tempus que, nisi Dei miles ligius dominus noster qui nunc est set per opon humaniter et obsedisset, per humanam estimacionem erat rigt unlikely to be conquered and won' (fol. 113r); Owst translates part of this passage in *Literature and Pulpit*, p. 84.

In a third sermon, on the theme 'Intrauit castellum', the preacher conflated elements of these two passages: from the 'old castel' of the Lollards have come 'the soldiers' who hurl 'sharp insults at the camp of God', 'shoot many vicious words at the poor friars', and 'cast a mine under the tower of the possessioners' (fol. 125r). Once again the hero was Henry v, whose timely action had averted still worse things, the kind reported to have occurred 'around Prague in the kingdom of Bohemia' (fol. 125r).⁹²

Another sermon, on the theme 'Exiuit de templo',⁹³ provided the preacher with the opportunity to relate these figures and themes to the Gospel incident of the cleansing of the temple. To begin, the preacher assigned metaphoric value to the temple's structure: its two pillars were the clergy and nobility, its walls the commons.⁹⁴ He then asked rhetorically why Jesus had gone out of the temple, and responded by accusing the three groups whom Jesus had once chased from there, the moneychangers, the sellers of sheep and oxen, and the sellers of doves, of taking up stones to kill him. It is the first group, the moneychangers ('numularii'), who concern us. But the preacher translated 'numularii' as the 'monimakers', '[those who] a cast so sore þe flynt of false opinions at þe piler of clergi þat þe true meror of fayth was in puncto to falle' (fol. 92v). These 'monimakers' are, of course, the Lollards, and their 'false opinions' are their attacks on the temporal possessions of the clergy which the preacher saw as nothing other than a get-rich-quick scheme cloaked in sanctimonious phrases which ultimately would overturn the pillar of the clergy, shatter the mirror of true faith, and bring the temple (England) to ruin.

Fortunately, God did not abandon England. He called forth Henry v, who moved decisively to thwart the most dangerous Lollard uprising by, metaphorically, overturning the cursed temple—or old castle.

But our gracious king, lamenting the ruin and misery of the temple of the Lord, manfully charged into the temple of the Lord, seized the invaders, probed them through the required examination by the clergy, and when no foundation of faith was found in them, he seized the water of devotion signed with the cross (for not because of vainglory or worldly honor but for the love of him who hung on the cross), he committed to the fire and burned all the supporters of error so that, one may hope, the whole cursed temple fell with its pillars. And if any part remained or sought to

⁹² This is probably an allusion to the reaction of certain nobility to the condemnation of Hus in 1415; see Leff, *Heresy* 2.650 ff.; 687 ff.

⁹³ This sermon also appears in Oxford, Bodleian Library Laud Misc. 706, fols. 63r-70v; and an outline of a sermon on the same theme with similar development appears in Worcester, Cathedral Library F. 10, fol. 68v.

⁹⁴ Elsewhere, interpreting the story of Josue's victory over Amalec (Ex 17:8-16), the preacher lamented that the clergy and nobility, who like Aaron and Ur should support the arms of Moses (the Church militant), instead bicker among themselves and Lollardy grows (Sermon 1, fols. 1r-2r).

be rebuilt, the king taught us the lesson how it could be destroyed: as soon as such are apprehended, they should be probed through the required examination, and if no faith is found in them nor any hope of regaining salvation, the torch will be applied and the fire burn them quickly lest the innocent be infected. In this way our gracious king overturned the cursed temple, he conquered the rebels within the temple of this kingdom who rose against the Lord and his anointed.⁹⁵

Once he had destroyed the false temple of the Lollards, Henry himself was chosen by God as the principal support of His own temple.

But the merciful Lord, seeing the ruin and misery of his temple, of this kingdom, which was on the point of being destroyed, out of his grace and mercy erected a strong pillar in the middle of the temple to sustain the whole structure, our gracious liege lord the king who now is. May God strengthen him in virtue and increase his honor.⁹⁶

This series of passages shows the preacher's awareness of the history of the disputes between the Lollards and the clergy. The emphasis he placed on the temporal possessions of the clergy and the political consequences of their removal recall the position stated in the parliamentary petition of 1406, and the details of Henry's procedures against Oldcastle's followers seem to reflect the process outlined in the petition presented in the Leicester parliament. The preacher also revealed his knowledge of Lollard polemic, for he very deftly turned the scriptural account of the cleansing of the temple, which Wyclif had used to justify secular intervention into ecclesiastical affairs, into the metaphoric occasion for royal intervention in defense of the clergy. However, there is another, unintended, irony in this. According to the preacher, Henry v, having driven out the profaners of God's temple, was now the new, and sole, pillar of that temple. He had rescued the clergy from the machinations of the Lollards, but had he not also supplanted them as pillars of the temple?

⁹⁵ 'Sed graciosus rex, condolens ruinam et miseriam templum domini, irrui humaniter in domini templi, inuasores cepit, eos fodit per debitam examinacionem cleri et, cum nullum reperiret in eis fidei fundamentum, cepit aquam deuocionis (sed cruce signatam quia non propter vanam gloriam aut mundi honorem sed propter amorem istius qui pendebat in cruce), ignem supposuit tot que erroris fautores, incendit que, vt speratur, totum maledictionis templum cum ipsis columpnis cecidit. Et si qua pars remanserit uel reedificari ceperit, rex docuit nos leccionem quomodo destrui possit: statim vt tales deprehenduntur, debita fodiantur examinacione et, si nulla fides reperiatur nec recuperande spes salutis, fasciculus applicetur et ignis incende eos tempestiue propter innocencium infeccionem. Isto modo noster graciosus [rex] euerit maledictum templum, isto modo vicit rebelles infra templum regni qui insurrexerunt aduersus Dominum et aduersus cristum eius' (fol. 96r).

⁹⁶ 'Sed misericors et miserator Dominus, videns ruinam et miseriam sui templi, huius regni, quod erat in puncto corruendi et destruendi, ex sua gratia et misericordia erexit fortem columpnam in medio templi ad sustentandum totum opus, nostrum ligium dominum graciosum regem qui nunc est. Deus fortificet ipsum in virtute et augeat ipsius honorem' (fol. 95v).

If that was a result, albeit unintended, of Henry's action, the preacher showed no anxiety about it. Throughout the sermons he depicted the king figuratively as the warrior-knight who, like Josue, conquered Israel's enemies and who, like the 'fortis armatus' of the gospel, vigilantly protected his own household. Indeed he was, as we have already seen, the 'miles dei', the 'celestis miles' sent at heaven's bidding to rid the kingdom of the devil's cursed army, the Lollards.⁹⁷ But the preacher was even more daring in his use of such apocalyptic imagery. As we have already seen (p. 000 above), he invoked 2 Mach 11:8, asserting that God had sent a 'heavenly, white-robed horseman armed with golden weapons, a lance brandished in his hand' to save his people from the armies of Antiochus.⁹⁸ Allegorically, he explained, this heavenly horseman was none other than Jesus, whom God had sent, 'riding upon the cross', to wage the spiritual battle that would deliver mankind from Satan's bondage.⁹⁹ However, he then 'applies this story to the current time'. The forces of Antiochus were still the devil's legions who had waged war 'not for a day or two but since the time of Wiclif', and against them 'the God of all our comfort and consolation sent to us this heavenly warrior, our liege lord the King' (fol. 35r). In a word, Henry v was like the archetype of all Christian warriors, Jesus himself, accomplishing at a particular historical moment what the savior had achieved for all time on the cross.

This analysis of the preacher's adaptations of well-known topoi reveals his preoccupation with the Lollard threat and his awareness of the Church's inability to deal with it. As a result, calls for personal conversion from perennial sinfulness, the hallmark of Bishop Brinton's preaching, have given way to emotional appeals for immediate eradication of the Lollard menace and, finally, to jubilation for the deliverance provided by Henry v.

In the notes accompanying the discussion of these topoi, I have tried to show that the figures and images in which the Benedictine preacher of Bodley 649 expressed his condemnation of the Lollards and support for Henry v were also

⁹⁷ For the development of the topos in Latin and vernacular texts, see M. LeMay, 'The Allegory of the Christ-Knight in English Literature' (Diss., The Catholic University of America, 1932), especially pp. 31-52; W. Gaffney, 'The Allegory of the Christ-Knight in *Piers Plowman*', *Proceedings of the Modern Language Association* 46 (1931) 155-68; R. Woolf, 'The Theme of Christ the Lover-Knight in Medieval English Literature', *The Review of English Studies* 13 (1962) 1-16, and *The English Religious Lyric in the Middle Ages* (Oxford, 1968), pp. 44 ff.; J. A. W. Bennett, *Poetry of the Passion. Studies in Twelve Centuries of English Verse* (Oxford, 1982), pp. 62-84; S. Wenzel, *Preachers, Poets, and the Early English Lyric* (Princeton, 1986), pp. 233-38. For the association of Henry v with heroic figures from scripture and antiquity, see the list compiled by Wylie, *Henry the Fifth* (1.188, 280-81) from popular poetry and chronicles.

⁹⁸ For the interpretation of Antiochus as anti-Christ, see, for example, Rabanus Maurus, *Commentaria in Libros Machabeorum* (PL 109.1134); in the same commentary Rabanus also associates Antiochus with heretics (PL 109.1135), as does Hugh of St. Victor, *Exegetica dubia: Allegoriae in Vetus Testamentum*, Book 9 (PL 175.750).

⁹⁹ For this element of the topos, see Woolf, 'Theme of Christ' as cited in note 97 above.

familiar in the popular political literature of his time, albeit only in words and phrases rather than the more extensive metaphoric development found in the Bodley sermons. It is, however, even more important to note, at least briefly, that the preacher's views, as well the figures and images he used, appeared prominently in the work of other Benedictines of the period, a fact which suggests that the order as a whole held a consistent position on these matters.

The best known Benedictine writer of the period was, of course, John Lydgate of Bury St. Edmunds, the kingdom's 'unofficial laureate'¹⁰⁰ and 'poet-propagandist'.¹⁰¹ In both occasional poems and longer didactic works, Lydgate praised Henry v as 'Goddiss knyght'¹⁰² and 'Goddess chaumpyoun',¹⁰³ placed him among the Worthies, and compared him to various scriptural and classical rulers and heroes.¹⁰⁴ Among the king's exemplary deeds, Lydgate invariably cited the defeat of the Lollards. For instance, in the 'Ballade to Henry vi upon his Coronation', he prayed that the new king 'mayst beo resemblable founde/Heretykes and Lollardes for to oppresse', as his father 'At þe gynnyng of his royal noblesse/Woyded al cokil fer oute of Syon' (lines 81-82, 85-86). But Lydgate's lengthiest tribute to such deeds came in 'A Defence of Holy Church', in which many of the themes and images of the Bodley 649 sermons appear. For example, Henry deserved praise for his efforts to 'kepe the *Temple hoolle*' (line 36; emphasis mine) and to 'delyuer out of woo and teen/*Noees shipp*' (lines 47-48; emphasis mine). Lydgate also made note of the danger to the Church's temporal possessions ('The libertees of Cristys mansioun', line 39) which the Lollards, like King Antiochus (line 135), would steal to enrich themselves ('For thay hemsilff the riches wolden use', line 133).¹⁰⁵

One might, understandably of course, regard Lydgate more as a spokesman of the Lancastrian court than as a representative Benedictine voice. However, there are at least two other monastic authors who described Henry's treatment of the Lollards in similar ways. The first, an anonymous monk of Westminster who served in some capacity in the king's household, wrote the *Versus rhythmici* in praise of Henry.¹⁰⁶ Besides his portrait of Henry's personal appearance, his list of heroic

¹⁰⁰ Scattergood, *Politics and Poetry*, p. 73.

¹⁰¹ D. Pearsall, *John Lydgate* (London, 1970), p. 169.

¹⁰² 'A Defence of Holy Church' in H. N. MacCracken, *The Minor Poems of John Lydgate, Part I: Religious Poems* (EETS ES 107; London, 1911), no. 10, lines 26, 69.

¹⁰³ 'Ballade to Henry vi upon his Coronation' in H. N. MacCracken, *The Minor Poems of John Lydgate, Part II: Secular Poems* (EETS OS 192; London, 1934), no. 31, line 59.

¹⁰⁴ 'Ballade to Henry vi upon his Coronation', lines 52-80; 'Lenvoye' of *Lydgate's Troy Book, Part III*, ed. H. Bergen (EETS 106; London, 1910), p. 877, lines 36-49; 'The Title and Pedigree of Henry vi' (MacCracken, *Secular Poems*, pp. 613-22, no. 28, line 217).

¹⁰⁵ For Henry v as the subject of this poem, see J. Norton-Smith, *John Lydgate. Poems* (Oxford, 1966), pp. 150-54. A. Renouir and C. D. Benson ('John Lydgate', *Manual* [1980], 6.1854) note that the date of this poem and Lydgate's authorship have been questioned.

¹⁰⁶ Printed in Cole, *Memorials of Henry the Fifth*, pp. 63-75.

exemplars, and his account of the king's character, holiness, and generosity to the Abbey of Westminster, he devoted considerable attention to his coronation, which he invested with traditional symbolism. On this sacred occasion, God had anointed his new chosen one (christus) and had surrounded him with an aura of heavenly, angelic light:

Curia regalis micat ornatu radiante,
Gloria mensalis non splendidior fuit ante.
Angelus in specie residebas, Rex decoratus (lines 63-65).¹⁰⁷

Much more original were the Messianic overtones and the light imagery used to describe Henry's defeat of Oldcastle. First, Henry was not only the traditional 'pugil ecclesie' and the 'protector patriae' (line 173), but also the 'miles Messiae' (line 174).¹⁰⁸ Furthermore, Oldcastle's uprising took place during the Epiphany celebrations and some versions of the event record a celestial phenomenon, usually thought to be a meteor, accompanying it.¹⁰⁹ While some writers, notably the author of the *Gesta Henrici quinti*, declined to speculate on the meaning of this 'star',¹¹⁰ the Westminster monk seized upon it. Like the prophet Isaiah (60:1-6), he proclaimed, 'Fulsit stella Dei, veniunt Regesque Sabaei' (line 175). The new king Henry, like the newly born Christ child, had not only been anointed at his coronation, but in this Epiphany had been manifested to the world as the defender of the Church and the savior of the kingdom.

The other, better known, representative of Benedictine views is Thomas Elmham, a monk of St. Augustine's, Canterbury, who became prior of the Cluniac house at Lenton and afterward vicar-general of the Cluniac foundations in England and Scotland.¹¹¹ Although his biography of Henry v, the *Liber metricus*,¹¹² was

¹⁰⁷ For the symbolism of the coronation rite, see P. E. Schramm, *A History of the English Coronation*, trans. L. G. Wickham Legg (Oxford, 1937), pp. 115-40; E. H. Kantorowicz, *The King's Two Bodies. A Study in Mediaeval Political Theory* (Princeton, 1957), pp. 87-93; for political propaganda associated with such rites, see J. W. McKenna, 'The Coronation Oil of Yorkist Kings', *EHR* 82 (1967) 102-104, and 'Henry vi of England and the Dual Monarchy: Aspects of Royal Political Propaganda, 1422-1432', *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 28 (1965) 145-62.

¹⁰⁸ For the use of the term 'pugil ecclesie' (or the similar one 'pugil fidei'), see Gregory xi's letter to Archbishop Sudbury and Bishop Courtenay in 1377 (Wilkins, *Concilia* 3.116); Gregory xi's letter to Edward iii (Wilkins, *Concilia* 3.118); Archbishop Arundel's praise of Henry iv in the Canterbury convocation of 1411 (Wilkins, *Concilia* 3.334); and Martin v's condemnation of Wycliffite and Hussite heresies in 1428 (Wilkins, *Concilia* 3.512); also see *Thomae de Elmham Vita et Gesta Henrici Quinti*, ed. T. Hearne (Oxford, 1727), p. 31 (the biography mistakenly attributed to Thomas Elmham and commonly known as 'Pseudo-Elmham'; see note 111 below).

¹⁰⁹ For other accounts of the meteor, see Wylie, *Henry the Fifth* 1.265.

¹¹⁰ *Gesta Henrici quinti*, p. 10; see also *Incerti scriptoris Chronicon*, p. 7.

¹¹¹ On Elmham, see DNB 6.727; A. Gransden, *Historical Writing in England II: c. 1307 to the Early Sixteenth Century* (London, 1982), pp. 206-210; for the argument that he used, but did not write, the *Gesta Henrici quinti* (see *Gesta Henrici quinti*, pp. xix-xxiii, and J. S. Roskell and F. Taylor,

written in 1418 after his transfer to Lenton, his thirty years at St. Augustine's, his career as historian of that house,¹¹³ and his continuing interest in Benedictine affairs—witness his role as a member of the commission of monks which met with Henry's representatives to discuss the king's proposals for reform¹¹⁴—make him a reputable source of Benedictine views.

Elmham's intention to make the *Liber metricus* a polemic against the Lollards is clear from the outset. As did Brinton and the preacher of Bodley 649, Elmham described events in apocalyptic terms. But for him, the Lollards were not just 'pseudoprophets' signalling the climactic struggle between the forces of God and Antichrist; rather, as in the Bodley sermons, Oldcastle himself was the principal enemy, the 'satellitit infernalis heresiarchae' (Preface, p. 82), a confederate of the 'draconis' (Preface, p. 82) and the 'bestia cornua bina ferens' (line 88) of the book of Revelation who led the forces of 'Babylon' (line 43) in their plots against God's 'Christum' (line 83).

As in the *Versus rhythmi*, the description of Oldcastle's Epiphany uprising underscores the symbolic association between Henry and Christ the Savior. Echoing the opening line of Venantius Fortunatus' 'Hymn to the Cross', Elmham described Henry's forces approaching St. Giles' Field in the way Christ triumphantly took up his cross: 'Vexillum Regis prodit' (line 119).¹¹⁵ The celestial phenomenon accompanying Henry's triumph was a 'fulgur amoenum' which 'detexit tenebras' (lines 129-130), not so much the star of Bethlehem as the transfiguring light of other Gospel episodes in which the Father confirmed his pleasure in his chosen one. Finally, Elmham summarized Oldcastle's defeat by declaring that 'Censuit ancipiti Rex hunc mucrone feriri' (line 97). Clearly, the imagery of the 'two-edged sword' with its scriptural overtones of divine vengeance (Ps 149:6; Apoc 2:12) was meant to suggest that the Church's strategy against the Lollards had succeeded, that ecclesiastical and secular authority were in harmony, as Henry, king and loyal son of the Church, acted decisively to uphold the true faith.¹¹⁶ But

'The Authorship and Purpose of the *Gesta Henrici quinti*: I', *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library* 53 [1970-71] 437 ff.).

¹¹³ Printed in Cole, *Memorials of Henry the Fifth*, pp. 79-165; for discussions of the symbolism and anti-Lollard elements, see Gransden, *Historical Writing*, pp. 206-210, and her earlier article 'Silent Meanings in Ranulf Higden's *Polychronicon* and in Thomas Elmham's *Liber metricus de Henrico quinto*', *Medium aevum* 46 (1978) 231-40.

¹¹⁴ *Historia Monasterii S. Augustini Cantuariensis*, ed. C. Hardwick (RS 8; London, 1858); discussed in Gransden, *Historical Writing*, pp. 345-55.

¹¹⁵ For Elmham as part of these proceedings, see Pantin, *Chapters of the Black Monks* 2.107.

¹¹⁶ *Lateinische Hymnendichter des Mittelalters*, ed. G. M. Dreves (Analecta hymnica Medii Aevi 50; Leipzig, 1907), p. 74.

¹¹⁶ The *Gesta Henrici quinti* also uses the image of a sword to describe Henry's action: 'censuit eum feriri gladio, primo spirituali, inde temporalis' (p. 4). No doubt Elmham is following the *Gesta* here, but the differences are significant. The *Gesta* specifies the spiritual and temporal powers, placing

in light of the issues discussed in this essay, the imagery may also suggest how much royal power had incorporated and subsumed independent ecclesiastical authority. Forty years earlier Uthred of Boldon had invoked the imagery of the two swords to argue in vain against the crown's encroachment on ecclesiastical privilege. Elmham, on the other hand, celebrated Henry's wielding of a single, two-edged sword. By suppressing the Lollards, Henry had indeed accomplished the desire of ecclesiastical officials, but he had also taught them that the preservation of religious orthodoxy and political order lay primarily in the vigorous exercise of royal leadership. As we have seen, the Benedictines, as well as others, welcomed Henry's leadership, confident, no doubt, that this pious warrior-hero would rejuvenate the ideals of medieval Christendom both in England and throughout Europe. They could hardly have realized to what different ends that power would be exercised by Henry's Tudor namesakes.

Manhattan College.

the spiritual first; Elmham presumably conflates the two powers by his word 'ancipiti' and omits the primacy of the spiritual. Perhaps that distinction is no longer important, or perhaps he is adopting the position set out by Henry in the decree of the Leicester parliament (see pp. 201-202 above).

MEDIEVAL LATIN POETIC ANTHOLOGIES (VI):
THE COTTON ANTHOLOGY OF HENRY OF AVRANCHES
(B.L. COTTON VESPASIAN D.V, FOLS. 151-184)

Peter Binkley

THE last article in this series described what, according to Russell, is the principal collection of poems of Henry of Avranches.¹ The other large collection of his poems (again, according to Russell's canon) is in London, British Library, Cotton Vespasian D.v (henceforth D), containing Russell's Nos. 104-158. The manuscript has not been properly described, and the nature of the poems is imperfectly conveyed in accounts by Russell, Hübinger, and Bund.² A fuller account therefore seems appropriate.

The whole codex is a seventeenth- and eighteenth-century Cottonian conflation, consisting of four originally separate sections, of which the last three are booklet size. The codex has been quired by letters a-z, presumably by Cotton's librarian Richard James. The four original sections are:

1) fols. 2-120. Peter Riga's *Aurora* (*Aurora. Petri Rigae Biblia Versificata*, ed. P. E. Beichner, 2 vols. [Publications in Mediaeval Studies, The University of Notre

¹ D. Townsend and A. G. Rigg, 'Medieval Latin Poetic Anthologies (V): Matthew Paris' Anthology of Henry of Avranches (Cambridge, University Library Dd.11.78)', *Mediaeval Studies* 49 (1987) 352-90. Following Russell's sigla, ms Dd.11.78 is designated 'A'; London, British Library Vespasian D.v. is designated 'D'. Poems are designated by their numbers in Russell's canon, thus: 'R118'. See J. C. Russell and J. P. Heironimus, *The Shorter Latin Poems of Master Henry of Avranches Relating to England* (The Medieval Academy of America, Studies and Documents 1; Cambridge, Mass., 1935; rpt., New York, 1970). I owe the physical description of the manuscript to Prof. A. G. Rigg, to whom I am grateful for his generous advice and encouragement, for his permission to include this article in his series on 'Medieval Latin Poetic Anthologies', and for his permission to quote from his forthcoming edition of the Bordo-Siler debate (R129-144).

² J. C. Russell, *Master Henry of Avranches* (Diss. Harvard, 1926) (hereafter Russell, *Master Henry*); 'Master Henry of Avranches as an International Poet', *Speculum* 3 (1928) 34-63; Russell and Heironimus, *Shorter Latin Poems*; P. E. Hübinger, 'Ein literarischer Fund zur Geschichte der Starkenburg und des Klosters Lorsch im 13. Jahrhundert' in *1200 Jahre Mark Heppenheim* (Veröffentlichungen zur Geschichte der Stadt Heppenheim 3; Heppenheim a. d. B., 1973), pp. 55-70; 'Libertas imperii – Libertas ecclesiae im Widerstreit. Ein bewegtes Kapitel aus der Geschichte von Maastricht, Lüttich und Aachen in den Tagen Kaiser Friedrichs II. und König Heinrichs (VII.)' *Zeitschrift des Aachener Geschichtsvereins* 84/85 (1978) 71-129; K. Bund, 'Mittelrheinische Geschichte des 13. Jahrhunderts im Spiegel der Dichtung: Untersuchungen zum Gedichtfragment Nr. 116 und zur Vita des mittellateinischen Dichters Magister Heinrich von Avranches', *Archiv für Frankfurts Geschichte und Kunst* 59 (1985) 9-78.

Dame 19; Notre Dame, 1965], not using this manuscript). The first page (fol. 2r) bears the inscription 'Robertus Cotton Bruceus', and the final page (fol. 120v) is very worn.

2) fols. 121-138. Poems of Hildebert (see A. Wilmart, 'Le florilège de Saint-Gatien. Contributions à l'étude des poèmes d'Hildebert et de Marbode', *Revue Bénédictine* 48 [1936] 171; A. B. Scott, D. F. Baker, and A. G. Rigg, 'The Biblical Epigrams of Hildebert of Le Mans: A Critical Edition', *Mediaeval Studies* 47 [1985] 272-316). The first page (fol. 121r) is inscribed 'Robertus Cotton' and is worn. The last page (fol. 138v) is blank except for some scribbles.

3) fols. 139-150. Grosseteste's *Templum Dei* (Robert Grosseteste. *Templum Dei*, ed. J. W. Goering and F. A. C. Mantello [Toronto Medieval Latin Texts 14; Toronto, 1984]; they do not use this manuscript).

4) fols. 151-184. The poetic anthology described below.

In this section the leaves measure 198 x 136 mm. There are four gatherings, 1⁸ 2⁸ 3¹⁰ 4⁸, quires w, x, y and z in the Cottonian quiring. The first page (fol. 151r) has been headed, in the hand of Richard James, 'Michaelis Cornubiensis Poemata'. A damp mark on fol. 151 has penetrated to fol. 154, but is not visible on fol. 150; the end of the booklet is also damaged by damp, from fols. 178-184 (affecting legibility on fols. 180-184). Clearly these four quires formed a separate booklet, probably lacking a cover.

Cotton obtained the booklet from the library of Henry Savile of Banke (1568-1617), probably after Savile's death but before 1621. It was one of a number of manuscripts that came to Savile from another Yorkshire collector, John Nettleton (d. 1597). Like Savile's grandfather (whose collection Savile inherited), Nettleton acquired manuscripts from northern monasteries: of the thirty-three Nettleton manuscripts in Savile's library, ten came from the Yorkshire Cistercian houses of Byland, Fountains, and Rievaulx, one from York, and one from Settrington, Yorkshire; the others have no reliable indication of provenance. It is very likely, therefore, that D was in a northern monastery at the time of the Dissolution.³

Although the booklet was prepared with some care for appearance (see below), the best parchment was not used. Several leaves have been repaired (before writing) with patches, notably on fols. 182 and 184. On fol. 183 there are two large wedge-shaped repairs: the writing is visible on the verso but lost on the recto, suggesting that a double patch was used and the front piece later fell off. On fol. 179 a crescent-shaped piece has been torn out after writing.

³ Savile's shorthand notation 'Netilton Hnry Savil' is at the top of fol. 151r (A. G. Watson, *The Manuscripts of Henry Savile of Banke* [London, 1969], p. 66, no. 261; J. P. Gilson, 'The Library of Henry Savile, of Banke', *Transactions of the Bibliographical Society* 9 [Oct. 1906-Mar. 1908] 208). For the history of Savile's collection see Watson, *Manuscripts*, pp. 6-11.

The booklet can be divided into two subsections, in different hands:

A. fols. 151-158. 1⁸. Writing frame 166 x 117 mm, framed on each side by heavily drawn triple lines. 29 lines per page in long line format. Each poem has a red initial; the initial letters of each line have been touched in red. This quire contains R104-126.

B. fols. 159-184. 2⁸ 3¹⁰ 4⁸ (originally 4¹⁰, lacks 1 and 10: see below). Writing frame 117 x 96 mm, framed on each side by triple lines. 32 lines per page in long line format. There are alternating blue and red initials for poems or sections within poems, but there is no touching of initials except on the first page. From fol. 179 to the end, the initials have not been completed. These quires contain R20, 127-158. The outer bifolium of quire z was lost before the manuscript was quired by James; there was therefore a leaf after fol. 176 (in the middle of R145) and one after fol. 184 (bearing the end of R158): see below, note 71.

There is no sign that parts A and B were ever kept separate after writing: there are no signs of wear on fols. 158v or 159r. The touching of initials on fol. 159r (the first page of part B) is in the same red ink as the touching, initials and rubrics in part A, and not the fainter and more powdery red of the initials in part B; the most likely explanation for this is that the two parts were put together before the rubrication of part A, and that the rubricator of part A carried on to the first page of part B. Since the hand of the rubrics in part A is not noticeably later than the text, this means that the two parts were assembled in the thirteenth century. There are fairly extensive marginal corrections and clarifications in part B; in part A there are only a few, probably not in the same hand as those in part B.⁴ Spaces for rubrics were left for all poems, but titles were executed in only two instances (R125 and R126), both in part A; these give no information that could not have been derived from the text. An early modern hand has noted in the margin the names and dates of English bishops mentioned in poems in part B (R146, 153, 154, 155).

Contents

An explanation of the grouping of sections of text into poems is necessary. Russell apparently assumed that every blank line in the manuscript marked the beginning of a new poem. In this he was inconsistent, however, for R145 (William

⁴ In Townsend and Rigg, 'Medieval Latin Poetic Anthologies (V)', 390, note 15, it was suggested that these corrections are in the hand of Matthew Paris; on further study this appears not to be the case. In what follows, these corrections are designated by the siglum d (assigned to them by Russell and Heironimus, *Shorter Latin Poems*, p. xi), without a distinction between the probably different hands in parts A and B.

of Laval) contains a blank line between sections (fol. 176v), and yet is treated by Russell as a single poem; while no blank line separates R143 from R144 (together forming the longest section of the Bordo-Siler debate). In fact, the scribes seem to have been inconsistent in their own practice. The clearest example of this is in R118-120 (Siegfried): here the scribe left blank lines and planned 2-line initials at the first two paragraph divisions (after 21 and 11 lines respectively), then seems to have realized that his text was a unit and therefore left no blank lines and planned only single-line initials for the last two paragraph divisions (after 6 and 8 lines respectively, leaving a final paragraph of 17 lines). Likewise, R114-117 are one continuous poem, as are R129-144 (the Bordo-Siler debate) and the two parts of R145 (William of Laval). The unity of these poems is clear from internal evidence (given below *ad loc.*). In the light of so many examples, it seems clear that the groupings of sections of text into poems must be done on the basis of internal evidence and not simply according to the scribal divisions.

Part A

[1] ST. STEPHEN: R104 (151r).

4 rhythmic stanzas of 14x8pp, rhymed abbabaaabaaaab. Not edited. Walther 18427.⁵

<D>olus (MS Solus) et sapiencia / desudant in certamine ... Stephani pacienciam / nullus curat attendere.

A poem in praise of St. Stephen and his virtues, notably forgiveness for one's enemies, which today is ignored. It is written as prose; stanzas begin with single-line coloured initials.

[2] CITY: R105 (151r-v).

14 lines in unrhymed elegiac couplets. Not edited. Walther 9503 ('Intrarit...'), 9507 ('Intravit...').

Intrarit clausam quicumque paludibus urbem ...
Nam quod clausa manent interiora luunt.⁶

A description of a city surrounded by swamps and pervaded by their miasma; corpses do not rot away but lie corrupt and stinking.

⁵ Walther numbers refer to H. Walther, *Initia carminum ac versuum Medii Aevi posterioris latinorum* (Carmina Medii Aevi posterioris latina 1; Göttingen, 1959).

⁶ luunt: the scribe has dotted the first minim, as if the word were 'liuunt', which does not scan. The text is probably corrupt.

Russell thought this poem might describe the city of Rome during its rebellion against Gregory IX between 1234 and 1235.⁷ It is more likely, in view of the next poem, to be a description of the port of Aquileia, which had fallen into disrepair because of damp, malaria, and abandonment.⁸ This poem may be a fragment from a work similar to the poem on the translation of Salisbury Cathedral (R20; see below no. 19).

[3] **ALDRICUS, BISHOP OF TRENT (1233):** R106 (151v).

12 lines in elegiac couplets *collaterales*. Not edited; lines 4-12 transcribed by Russell (*Master Henry*, p. 129). Walther 15664.

Qui sic Aldrice propellere te uoluerunt ...
Hoste triumphato plus metuendus eris.

To Aldricus: his election had been challenged, but his accusers were put down when the Patriarch decided the case; now that he is being consecrated they have even more cause to weep.

This is Aldricus (or Aldrigetus) de Castro Campo, bishop of Trent;⁹ the Patriarch is Bertold de Merania, Patriarch of Aquileia (cf. R110 below). Aldricus' election was disputed (both by a legal challenge and through bloody persecution of his supporters in Trent) by a faction within the chapter led by Jacobus de Lizzana, who is mentioned in this poem.¹⁰ The poem was written on the occasion of Aldricus' consecration in August or September of 1233.¹¹ It deals with the legal challenge in the Patriarch's court rather than the insurrection in the Trentino, and was therefore probably written at Aquileia.¹²

⁷ Russell, *Master Henry*, p. 127.

⁸ P. Paschini, 'Bertoldo di Merania patriarca d'Aquileia (1218-1251)', *Memorie storiche forogiuliesi* 16 (1920) 36-37; the sixteenth-century chronicler Giovan Candido described the city in Bertold's time as an unhealthy place where water from the clogged aqueducts produced noisome swamps that spread pestilent air over the port ('... la citta d'Aquileia coperta de roui, e per tristo aria corrotta in guisa che le acque marcite sendo rinchiusi gli acquedutti, haueano fatto le paludi noiose, che spirauano pestifero fiato ...'): *Commentarii di Giovan Candido Giureconsulto de i fatti d'Aquileia* (Venice, 1544), fol. 55v.

⁹ For an account of the disputed election, see B. Waldstein-Wartenberg, *Geschichte der Grafen von Arco im Mittelalter* (Schlern-Schriften 259; Innsbruck - Munich, 1971), pp. 59-61; R. Kink, ed., *Codex Wangianus* (Fontes rerum austriacarum, 2 Abt., 5; Vienna, 1852), nos. 164, 166-168 (pp. 351-59).

¹⁰ Presertim Iacobus, qui susplantare parabat

Electum, reprobis spe pereunte labat. (lines 7-8)

¹¹ Aldricus was elected on 31 August 1232, and consecrated between 23 August and 10 September 1233 (F. dell'Oro and H. Rogger, eds., *Monumenta liturgica ecclesiae tridentinae saeculo XIII antiquiora*, I: *Testimonia chronographica ex codicibus liturgicis* [Trent, 1983], pp. 82-83). The *terminus ad quem* for his consecration is provided by Kink (*Codex Wangianus*, no. 162, p. 348).

¹² Russell, who was unaware of the disputed election, suggested a date of August 1236, when Frederick II intervened in the troubled financial affairs of the diocese (Russell, *Master Henry*, p. 129).

[4] FEAST OF ST. NICHOLAS: R107 (151v-152r).

7 lines in unrhymed elegiac couplets (incomplete). Not edited. Walther 6474.

Festa subalternant Nicholaos ille uocauit ...

Nos qui conuiue sumus huius simus et eius, etc.

The poet praises St. Nicholas and a certain Nicholas who is providing a feast on his name day.

The founder of the feast may be Nicholas de Castro Arquato (see below), with whom the author of R111 was accustomed to feast: '...Et michi qui soleo conuiuio carpere tecum ...' (R111 line 9).

[5] HUGH, BISHOP OF CLERMONT: R108 (152r-v).

28 lines in unrhymed elegiac couplets. Not edited; lines 1-12 transcribed by Russell (*Master Henry*, p. 125). Walther 16877.

De Hugone Clarimontis episcopo.

Roma tuum nomen exaltat episcopo Clari / Montis ...

Et res est voci consona uoxque rei.

Praise of the generosity of Hugh the bishop of Clermont, written for the occasion of some honour being bestowed on him at Rome.

This is M. Hugh de la Tour, elected in April 1227 at the age of 29. Because he had not yet reached the canonical age of thirty, he was not confirmed as bishop at this time, although the Pope granted him the administration of the diocese in spiritual and temporal affairs. His confirmation probably followed within the year, after his thirtieth birthday.¹³ Hugh, along with Milo, bishop of Beauvais (see R126), participated in Gregory IX's campaign against the Emperor's forces in central Italy in 1229.¹⁴ Another possible occasion is in the summer of 1238, when Hugh came to the curia as ambassador from the king of France.¹⁵ These dates are at the extremes of the period when Henry of Avranches is thought to have been in Italy.

¹³ Russell identified the occasion of this poem as the issuing of a bull of 13 April 1234 (L. Auvray et al., eds., *Les registres de Grégoire IX*, 4 vols. [Paris, 1896-1955], no. 1883) removing the diocese of Clermont from the care of the archbishop of Vienne and the consequent assumption of full episcopal authority by Hugh (Russell, *Master Henry*, p. 125). In fact, this bull merely freed the diocese of Clermont from the legatine jurisdiction of the Archbishop of Vienne, who had recently been appointed to combat heresy in the south of France (Auvray, *Les registres*, no. 1472). This was thus purely an administrative affair, and not a likely occasion for this poem.

¹⁴ D. Waley, *The Papal State in the Thirteenth Century* (London, 1961), p. 138.

¹⁵ Auvray, *Les registres*, nos. 4358, 4397, 4761, 4762.

An English-Latin pun seems to be implied in line 4: 'Tuque uenire rogas: inde uocaris Hugo'; this may be the source of Michael of Cornwall's pun *Hugo* = *Huc* go, 'come hither'.¹⁶

[6] **FOR A GRADUATE IN CANON LAW: R109 (152v).**

13 unrhymed hexameters. Not edited. Walther 18742.

Sume librum iuris, doctor, uerbique relator ...
Introeas quando plus uillicus esse nequibis.

A *datio libri* from a graduation ceremony for a doctor of canon law.¹⁷ The new lawyer is advised to be a father to orphans, a bishop to the church, a husband to widows. This must derive from a university, but there is nothing to indicate which one.

[7] **BERTOLDUS (PATRIARCH OF AQUILEIA?): R110 (152v-153r).**

12 lines in elegiac couplets *Leonini*. Not edited. Walther 11407.

Multos tu multus facis hic, Bertolde, tumultus ...
Seu bene siue male sit michi, uiue, uale.

The poet has thrice sought asylum with Bertold, but the latter has become so difficult that it is time for the poet to leave. He is not unmindful of Bertold's help and would like to remain in such good circumstances, but he must say farewell. Bertold seems to have provided room and board; the poet hopes to improve his lot by acquiring an amanuensis:

Esurii <R>ome,¹⁸ dapibus nimis hic repleo me;
Esse uolo melius quam modo siue prius,
Sumptu namque pari michi cum scriptore morari
Et mens est et opus, dum p<er>agatur (MS pagatur) opus (lines 7-10).

Bertold is probably the Patriarch of Aquileia, Bertold de Merania (1218-51);¹⁹ cf. R106 above.

¹⁶ A. Hilka, 'Eine Mittellateinische Dichterfehde: Versus Michaelis Cornubiensis contra Henricum Abrincensem' in *Mittelalterliche Handschriften: Paläographische, kunsthistorische, literarische und bibliotheksgeschichtliche Untersuchungen. Festgabe zum 60. Geburtstage von Hermann Degering*, ed. A. Bömer, J. Kirchner (Leipzig, 1926; rpt. Hildesheim - New York, 1973), pp. 123-54, lines 524-525 (hereafter cited as 'Michael').

¹⁷ See H. Rashdall, *The Universities of Europe in the Middle Ages*, ed. F. M. Powicke and A. B. Emden, 1 (Oxford, 1936), p. 228, note 1.

¹⁸ MS 'tome' corrected by d in the margin and then cropped, so that only the final 'e' remains. 'Rome' is suggested by Bund ('Mittelrheinische Geschichte', 59).

¹⁹ C. Eubel, *Hierarchia catholica Medii Aevi* 1, ed. altera (Munich, 1913), p. 99. Bund ('Mittelrheinische Geschichte', 59-60) suggested Bertold of Ürslingen, the regent of Tuscany; there is no positive evidence to support this.

[8] NICHOLAS, PATRIARCH OF CONSTANTINOPLE, I (1234): R111 (153r).

22 lines in unrhymed elegiac couplets. Not edited; lines 1-2, 21-22 transcribed by Russell, *Master Henry*, p. 126 (followed without a break by lines from R113). Walther 19059.

Te, Nicholae, decus quod promouet, ammouet; et qui ...
Teque docente regat unus utrosque Deus.

Nicholas has been elected Patriarch of Constantinople; the poet wishes him a smooth journey. His old flock will grieve to see him go, as will the poet, who is accustomed to feast with him; but he will accomplish great things: the Greeks will be made subservient, and the schism will be healed. This is Nicholas de Castro Arquato, bishop of Spoleto and papal vicechancellor, translated to Constantinople in 1234.²⁰ Cf. R113.

[9] DEAN OF MAASTRICHT: R112 (153r-154r).

32 unrhymed hexameters. Edition in progress by Peter Binkley. Walther 17225.

Sancte pater, si queque tuos iniuria sensus ...
Dampnet et indempnem tua me precor ultio reddat.

Addressed to the Pope. If every injury came to your attention, you would not have time for them all; therefore the 'concio fratrum' has investigated the course of events and left it to you to decide. When your legate knows how much I have suffered as dean of Maastricht ('Traiectensis'), driven from my church because I fought for its liberty (as lord Otto knows), I ask that you do as the laws require. The bishop excommunicated the wrong-doers, who nevertheless dared to celebrate mass. The legates from Reims imposed the same punishment, but the culprits refused to recognize the excommunication, and wrote to you to be absolved. I ask that they be condemned and that I be restored.

The poem deals apparently with the affairs of the Dean of St. Servais, a collegiate church at Maastricht (although 'Traiectensis' could also indicate Utrecht); there is however no positive external evidence for the events described. This poem was thought by Russell to be autobiographical, an idea rightly dismissed by Hübinger;²¹ it is in fact one of a series of poems in which the poet as advocate presents his

²⁰ Eubel, *Hierarchia*, p. 206; L. Santifaller, *Beiträge zur Geschichte des Lateinischen Patriarchats von Konstantinopel (1204-1261), und der venezianischen Urkunde* (Weimar, 1938), pp. 38-42. Nicholas was consecrated as patriarch by Gregory IX between April and August 1234, perhaps after some form of election by the chapter at Constantinople.

²¹ Russell, *Master Henry*, pp. 129-30; Russell, 'Master Henry', 50, note 1; Russell and Heironimus, *Shorter Latin Poems*, p. 11; Hübinger, 'Libertas imperii', 74, note 6.

patron's plea in the first person (cf. the Starkenburg poem [R114-117] and the Bourges-Bordeaux debate [R128] below). Hübinger assigned the poem to a date between the summer of 1231 and late 1233, identifying 'lord Otto' with Cardinal Otto of St. Nicolas in Carcere Tulliano, who was sent as legate to Germany in 1229.²² Hübinger seems, however, to have overlooked the mention of the delegates of the Archbishop of Reims,²³ nor is any delegation from Reims known in the affairs of St. Servais during this time. Russell supposed that the poem dealt with the episcopal election at Liège (in whose diocese Maastricht lies) in 1238, which led to civil war in the diocese, as a result of which the Archbishop of Reims was delegated to investigate the claims of the rival parties and submit the case to the curia (18 November 1238);²⁴ the dispute was decided by the Pope on 29 May 1239.²⁵ In the absence of positive evidence it is impossible to decide between the two proposed dates; if the authorship of Henry of Avranches is accepted, then the earlier date would seem to fit better with his known appearances at the papal curia.

[10] NICHOLAS, PATRIARCH OF CONSTANTINOPLE, II (1234): R113 (154r).

16 hexameters *Leonini*. Not edited; lines 1-3, 7-9, 12 transcribed by Russell (*Master Henry*, p. 126, following lines from R111 without a break). Walther 14242.

Pontificem placidum genuit (MS gemuit) Placencia, qui dum ...
Laude coronentur tua qui uexilla sequentur.

Piacenza produced a bishop whom Spoleto grieves to lose; but the Greeks rejoice in their new Patriarch of Constantinople, Nicholas. See R111 above.

[11] STARKENBURG (1228): R114-117 (154r-156r).

117 unrhymed hexameters. Edition in progress by Peter Binkley; R114/1-5 transcribed by Russell (*Master Henry*, p. 176); R116 is also transcribed on p. 176; Bund p. 11. R114: Walther 17224; R115: Walther 13447; R116: Walther 17221; R117: Walther 18588.

²² Hübinger, 'Libertas imperii', 74-75, 111; Otto's delegation lasted from February 1229 to mid-1231, and he was in Liège in February 1230: E. Winkelmann, 'Die Legation des Kardinaldiakons Otto von S. Nicolaus in Deutschland, 1229-1231', *Mitteilungen des Instituts für Oesterreichische Geschichtsforschung* 11 (1890) 28-40.

²³ Et delegati Remensis rursus eandem

Infixere reis pro tanto crimine penam (lines 21-22).

²⁴ Auvray, *Les registres*, no. 4587. The letter does not, as Russell says, appoint the archbishop 'to investigate the situation at Maastricht' (Russell, *Master Henry*, p. 130); Maastricht is not mentioned.

²⁵ Russell, *Master Henry*, p. 130.

Sancte pater, cuius regis excellencia mundum ...
Inferres, oculusque tuus non parceret ulli.

Ordinis (MS Ardinis) ut uideo sacri reuerende professor...
Et tunc liberius potero decernere verum.

Sancte pater, cause breuis est tenor. Ambo potentes ...
Ferre potentatu cuiuslibet arma tyranni.

Stat sublime secus et inexpugnabile castrum ...
Plurima predati bona sunt, nichil iste reliquit.

(R114) (To the Pope). Holy Father, your excellence rules the world. If your knowledge could match your zeal, who would not fear to sin? But today there is no reverence for honesty. Therefore I wish that you would ask me to tell you those things that I pray you will want to hear. If you knew what I have suffered, I would not go unavenged.

(R115) (The Pope responds). Professed monk, whoever you are, what is the cause of your quarrel? I will avenge your wrong; but so that justice may be done, I wish to know more about the case. For if your enemy can defend himself and his deeds, he shall go free; if not, he will be punished. Let me therefore be instructed, so that I may discern the truth.

(R116) (The Plaintiff responds). Holy Father, the tenor of the cause is brief. We were related, both powerful, but he betrayed me. An imperial monastery was subject to me, and the King of the Germans and other nobles held fiefs from me; with my own power I could oppose any tyrant.

(R117) I had a castle called Starkenburg (*Mons Fortis*),²⁶ the envy of dukes; the Archbishop of Mainz wanted to obtain it. One day while I celebrated mass, my *ministeriales* rebelled, seized the castle, and drove me out. You excommunicated the rebels; the sentence was confirmed by the Archbishop of Mainz and other abbots and bishops. The rebels scorned the sentence, so the king outlawed them. They pillaged the monastery's lands around the castle. Now the Archbishop of Mainz claims to have bought the castle from the rebels, whom he himself had excommunicated, and he refuses to restore it to me. I would rather the thieves still had it; for though they took much, he leaves nothing for me.

Hübinger and Bund have treated the parts of this poem as unconnected fragments. Russell was more ambiguous: at one point he grouped R114, 116 and 117 together as a 'a plea [to] the pope',²⁷ while elsewhere he refers to all four as 'an interesting series of poems', although he misunderstood R115 as an address to a judge.²⁸ Bund's extended discussion of R116, which he takes to be a fragment

²⁶ The form 'Starkenber^g' was in use in the thirteenth century; see Hübinger, 'Ein literarischer Fund', 61.

²⁷ Russell, *Master Henry*, p. 130.

²⁸ Russell, *Master Henry*, pp. 175-76.

of a lost work, admits only in passing the possibility of it being associated with R117.²⁹

Hübinger's analysis of the context of R117 applies to the poem as a whole. The speaker seems to be Conrad, Abbot of Lorsch, who was deposed probably in 1228 by the abbot of Wernweiler and an unnamed colleague, who had been appointed by the Pope to make a visitation at Lorsch, whose temporal and spiritual condition was lamentable. They found that Conrad had committed dilapidation and other enormities; at the request of the Dean and Chapter, they united Lorsch to the church of Mainz, so that the latter could help the abbey recover. Mainz had already redeemed a castle belonging to Lorsch (clearly Starkenburg):

...ecclesiam nostram in multis reformauerit, redimendo castrum ipsius ecclesiae
prouide de manu fortiorum, in quo castro multa pars ecclesiae nostrae consistit,
praeterea multas alias possessiones eiusdem Ecclesiae nostrae per potentiam suam
recuperauit.

The Dean and Chapter reported all this to the Pope and asked him to confirm the arrangement; this he did in a letter to Siegfried, Archbishop of Mainz, on 4 May 1229.³⁰ Siegfried seems to have taken Starkenburg by 11 January 1228, for he dated a document there on that day.³¹

It is not clear at what stage in these events the poem was written. The phrase 'suberat michi domus imperialis' (R116 line 6) may indicate that Conrad had already been deposed; but no other hint of this is given, and it is not clear why he would seek the recovery of Starkenburg when he was no longer abbot. The Dean's letter contains no hint of acrimony in the abbey's dealings with Siegfried over

²⁹ Bund, 'Mittelrheinische Geschichte', 34. Bund discusses a number of possible contexts for R116, and favours the theory that it was written for Bishop Heinrich II of Worms at Rome at the beginning of 1231, as one of the *carmina* mentioned in R123 (q.v.) ('Mittelrheinische Geschichte', 69). Bund's discussion turns on line 6, which in the manuscript reads:

Aura mihi suberat domus imperialis ...

Bund took 'Aura' to be a corruption of a place name, and investigated various possible readings: 'Lorsa' or 'Laura' for Lorsch (*Laurissa*), 'Nuhusa' or 'Neusa' or 'Et Nova' for Neuhausen, etc. ('Mittelrheinische Geschichte', 32-36). Only 'Laura' is likely on paleographical grounds, and must stand as the extremely rare Greek loanword *laura* (see C. du Cange, *Glossarium mediae et infimae latinitatis*, ed. L. Favre, 10 vols. [Paris, 1937-38], s.v.), or as an unattested form of *Laurissa*, or as a pun on the two. A more likely reading is 'Iure' (mentioned as a possibility by Bund, 'Mittelrheinische Geschichte', 33); cf. R128, lines 20-21: '[Aquitania] ... primacieque uerendo / Iure subest Bituri'

³⁰ A. Potthast, *Regesta Pontificum Romanorum*, 2 vols. (Berlin, 1874-75), no. 8391, 1.721. This letter (misdated 1232) and the Dean's letter (undated) are included by Trithemius in his *Chronicon sponheimense* (Johannes Trithemius, *Opera historica*, ed. M. Fresher [Frankfurt 1601; rpt. Frankfurt-am-Main, 1966], part 2, pp. 272-73). For an account of the last years of Lorsch as a Benedictine abbey see F. Knöpp, 'Das letzte Jahrhundert der Abtei' in *Die Reichsabtei Lorsch, Festschrift zum Gedenken an ihre Stiftung 764*, ed. F. Knöpp, 2 vols. (Darmstadt, 1973-77), 1.175-226.

³¹ Bund, 'Mittelrheinische Geschichte', 38, note 192: it was a confirmation of a charter of Abbot Conrad, originally issued in 1224.

Starkenbourg, and implies that the castle had been restored. Between the time of the abbot's appeal to Rome (known only from this poem) and the Dean's letter, therefore, Siegfried restored Starkenbourg to the abbey, and the monks of Lorsch became willing to forget his attempt to retain it. Hübinger's suggested date, the end of 1228 or the beginning of 1229, immediately before the Dean's letter,³² may therefore be rather late; a date no later than early 1228 might be more appropriate.

[12] SIEGFRIED, ARCHBISHOP OF MAINZ: R118-120 (156v-157v).

63 unrhymed hexameters. Not edited; R118/14-15 transcribed by Russell (*Master Henry*, p. 82); R120/23-31 (*Master Henry*, p. 77). R118: Walther 1379 ('Aptatos...'); R119: Walther 11752; R120: Walther 7599

<O>ptat<u>s (MS Aptatos), Sifride, diu, bene ueneris;
omnes / Mirantur, Romam que sit tibi causa uidendi.

...

Siquis Erardinos spoliaret iure ueterno.

Neue susurronum predictis curia uellet ...

Nec liuor tibi detraheret, nisi maximus esses.

Hec sunt que de te uulgaris opinio ponit ...

Confugiens supplex reliquos mea musa relinquit.

(R118) Welcome, Siegfried! Everyone wonders why you have come to Rome. I would not seem to be a prophet (*uates*) unless I prophesied both the inward and outward causes of your arrival. The people are deceived by rumours that you have come for the sake of justice, lest you suffer no punishment (*ne nil paciare molesti*). You are surrounded by false friends and hidden enemies, who say that you harass the clergy, and that you have ordered that priests not offer hospitality to pilgrims, creating complaints and prejudice for scholars (among whom I once counted myself) and allowing anyone to strip the *Everhardini* of their ancient rights.

(R119) Lest the curia give credence to the aforesaid whisperings, you wished to say some words on your own behalf to the Pope. You say hello to him, but you would rather say goodbye, if your business could be swiftly completed. The calumnies you suffer increase your fame, for spite would not attack you if you were not so great.

(R120) These are the vulgar rumours; but they are false. Discord does not come from you, as is proved by your very name: 'Si' is *Sit*, 'Frid' is *pax*, therefore 'Sifridus' means 'let there be peace'. Now that I've shown that the rumours are false, I must show why you have come, for it may be that you intend one thing while the divine will intends another. Whether His will directs the ends of these affairs, or whether the cause of your coming is to help your own business, piety

³² Hübinger, 'Ein literarischer Fund', 64; cf. Bund, 'Mittelrheinische Geschichte', 37-39, 42.

finds (rhetorical) material: lest I go hungry, or the innkeeper seize my belongings, or I wear rented clothes. My whole redemption depends on you, who have no equal. My muse flees to you, and abandons the others.

Russell and Bund have treated R118-120 as independent pieces, all addressed to Siegfried III, archbishop of Mainz (nephew of the Archbishop Siegfried who seized Starkenburg). Bund places R118 and R119 later than R120, and all later than R123;³³ this is based on faulty assumptions about R123 (q.v.). Russell tentatively suggested dates of November 1234-January 1235 for R118 and July-August 1235 for R120.³⁴ The unity of the three parts, however, seems so patent that the onus of proof is on the side of those who would argue for their independence. The poet ironically offers the Archbishop a way to quash the rumours: he has come not to answer charges before the curia but to remedy the poet's poverty! The poet's endorsement of the Archbishop should be worth all the more because the poet is himself one whom the Archbishop is accused of having wronged.

The poem refers to Siegfried's order that wandering scholars be shown no hospitality by priests, a reference to the synod of Mainz in July 1233.³⁵ It was written on the occasion of Siegfried's visit to Rome to see the Pope. Siegfried is known to have made three trips to Italy: March to May 1232, November 1234 to spring 1235, and June to October 1238.³⁶ On none of these occasions was the curia in the city of Rome.³⁷ The second trip seems most likely, however: we have evidence that Siegfried visited the curia (at Perugia: see below under R123), and the harsh persecution of heretics in Germany might have led to the rumours referred to. The word 'Rome' is therefore probably used loosely to indicate the curia, on the principle 'Ubi Papa, ibi Roma'. A less likely possibility is that Siegfried passed through Rome on his way to the curia; this would tend to support a date during his third trip, when the curia was in Anagni.

[13] **EKBERT, BISHOP OF BAMBURG** (in or before 1237): R121 (157v).

8 hexameters *Leonini caudati*. Not edited. Walther 20394.

Uir dilecte Deo, magnatum flos, Egeberte ...

Liber captiui patruus miserere nepotis.

³³ Bund, 'Mittelrheinische Geschichte', 63-64.

³⁴ Russell, *Master Henry*, pp. 127-29.

³⁵ Bund, 'Mittelrheinische Geschichte', 67. Note that this prohibition is mentioned in another poem attributed to Henry of Avranches: R79 *Miramur de Germania*, edited by E. Winkelmann in 'Vier Gedichte des dreizehnten Jahrhunderts', *Monatschrift für die Geschichte Westdeutschlands* 4 (1878) 341-42.

³⁶ Bund, 'Mittelrheinische Geschichte', 66.

³⁷ During Siegfried's three trips to Italy the curia was in Rieti, Perugia and Anagni respectively (Potthast, *Regesta Pontificum* 1.762 ff., 831 ff., 899 ff.).

The poet writes to Egebertus to ask him to help his (Egebertus') paternal nephew, who is held captive by the Sieneſe ('impia S<e>na',³⁸ line 3).

Egebertus is a rare name, and muſt be Ekbert de Merania, biſhop of Bamberg (1203-37)³⁹ and brother of Bertold de Merania, Patriarch of Aquileia. He had one paternal nephew: Otto, ſon of his and Bertold's brother Otto, the Duke of Merania.⁴⁰ There is no record of his having been held captive in Siena. Ekbert himſelf was in debt to Sieneſe merchants in 1231 and 1235.⁴¹

[14] PETITION CONCERNING AMPHIMACRI (1228 X 1241): R122 (157v-158r).

13 hexameters *Leonini*. Not edited. Walther 17223.

Sancte pater, cuius disponitur omne manu ius ...

Ostentum peteris huius, nec plura peteris.

To Pope Gregory. The poet asks the Pope to change four *nomina sacra* from amphimacri to anapeſts, ſo that holy things may be expreſſed in holy verſes.

This poem refers to a documented event in the life of Henry of Avranches. When Henry read his *Vita Franciſci* before the Pope, he was criticized by one of the courtiers for uſing the word *caritas* in a hexameter, deſpite the fact that it ſcans as an amphimacer (long-short-long). Henry appealed to the Pope that diuine words ought not to obey human laws of ſcanſion; Gregory agreed, and granted Henry licence to uſe theſe words.⁴² Three words are mentioned in the account of

³⁸ MS ſona; d has written a very faint 'e' above the 'o'. Bund ('Mittelrheinische Geſchichte', 59) ſuggeſted 'zona' = 'money pouch', i.e. a large ranſom was demanded; but the reading 'Sena' is confirmed by the rhyme:

Attinet ille tibi quem detinet impia S<e>na;

Dumque ſenſit ibi tuus eſt pudor, et ſua pena (altered from 'pona'). (lines 3-4)

³⁹ Eubel, *Hierarchia*, p. 126.

⁴⁰ Bund, 'Mittelrheinische Geſchichte', 58-59.

⁴¹ F. Schneider, ed., *Regestum ſenense* 1 (Regesta chartarum Italiae 8; Rome, 1911) p. 383, no. 867 (17 September 1231; Schneider miſprints '1221'); Auvray, *Les registres*, no. 2409 (16 January 1235). See E. D. Engliſh, *Enterprise and Liability in Sieneſe Banking, 1230-1350* (Speculum Anniversary Monographs 12; Cambridge, Maſſ., 1988), p. 12, note 8 and p. 48

⁴² The account comes from an anonymous proſe prologue found in the Verſailles manuſcript of Henry's *Vita ſancti Franciſci*:

In cuius [ſc. Gregory IX] praeſentia metris ineptum 'caritatis' vocabulum ei [ſc. Henry] cum obiceretur, defendit quod gentiles poëtae, qui metro excluserant, eiſ ignorarent virtutem. Sic 'trinitas', 'unitas', et ſi qua ſunt ſimilia poſuit, indignum reputans diuinae ſignificationis vocabula legibus ſubici poetarum. Approbavit Chriſti vicarius piaſe deſenſionis reſponſum, ſuaque poni auctoritate decrevit; unde vita haec metrica a nonnullis eſt 'Caritas' ob diſpenſationem vocabuli appellata.

P. Collegii S. Bonaventurae, eds., *Henricus Abrincenſis. Legenda verſificata ſ. Franciſci Aſſiſienſis*

this incident: *caritas*, *unitas*, and *trinitas*; the fourth must be *veritas* (used in the *Vita Francisci* 3.106).⁴³ Henry does not seem to have made use of his papal licence in other works. The poem can therefore be dated soon after the composition of the *Vita sancti Francisci* (after 1228), and certainly before the death of Gregory IX in 1241.

[15] HENRY, BISHOP OF EICHSTÄTT: R123 (158r).

16 hexameters *Unisoni* in couplets. Not edited; lines 4-9 transcribed by Russell (*Master Henry*, p. 77). Not in Walther.

<E>statis (MS Sstatis) honos, releuans de puluere pronos ...
Et cum deest es,⁴⁴ tum bene scis tu quid sit honestum.

To Henry, bishop of Eichstätt, asking him to recommend the poet to Siegfried, on account of the poet's poverty. The poet points out that bishop Henry is indebted to him: 'scripsi tibi carmina Rome' (line 11).

Russell misread the poem, thinking that it was addressed by Henry (of Avranches) to Siegfried;⁴⁵ the vocative 'Henrice' (line 8) is, however, confirmed by the rhyme. Bund felt that the paleographical evidence did not admit of a definite solution to the corrupt first word, and on other grounds settled on the reading '<Wormaci>ensis'.⁴⁶ There would seem to be no good reason, however, to reject the simpler reading '<E>statis',⁴⁷ especially since the rubricator often mistook the initials in this manuscript (cf. R104, 115, 118). There were three bishops of Eichstätt named Henry in this period: Henry of Zipplingen (1225-29); Henry of Tischningen (1229-34); and Henry of Ravensburg (1234-39).⁴⁸ There is no internal evidence to suggest which of the three is intended.⁴⁹ The most likely explanation

(Florence, 1936), p. 122. The Versailles manuscript was written at the end of the thirteenth or beginning of the fourteenth century (*Legenda versificata*, p. ix); but the story was known to Matthew Paris, who in his copy of the *Vita* wrote 'Excusa per privilegium' against the offending 'caritas', and 'Trinitas, Vnitas, Caritas: licentiatu ponit auctor' at the bottom of the page (A, fol. 205v); cf. Townsend and Rigg, 'Medieval Latin Poetic Anthologies (V)', 385-86.

⁴³ *Legenda versificata*, p. 122, note 3.

⁴⁴ The main hand wrote 'Et cum uestes'; d corrected this to 'cum dees es' above the line, then stroked this through and wrote 'Et cum deest es' below the line.

⁴⁵ Russell, *Master Henry*, pp. 69, 128-29.

⁴⁶ Bund, 'Mittelrheinische Geschichte', 61-67.

⁴⁷ A plausible spelling for 'Eichstätt', normally latinized as 'Eistetensis' but also 'Astetensis', 'Estedensis', and several forms in '-stat-' and '-stad-' ([J. G. T.] Graesse, [F.] Benedict, [H.] Plechl, *Orbis latinus*, 3 vols. [Braunschweig, 1972], s.v. 'Eistetensis'). The English scribes of D had a limited familiarity with foreign place-names: cf. 'sona' for 'Sena' (R121), 'Aquila borch' for 'A Kyleborch' and 'Grimbroch' for 'Grimborch' (R147), and even 'tome' for 'Rome' (R110).

⁴⁸ Eubel, *Hierarchia*, p. 243.

⁴⁹ Bund's discussion of R123 ('Mittelrheinische Geschichte', 61-67) is based on a number of false assumptions. First, it is assumed that the poet was not yet acquainted with Archbishop Siegfried and

is that R123 and R118-120 (to Siegfried) were written in January of 1235, when Siegfried of Mainz and Henry of Eichstätt were both probably at the curia in Perugia.⁵⁰ The poems to bishop Henry at 'Rome' (the curia) were probably written in early 1233 during the lawsuit over his election.⁵¹

[16] **CARNIVAL:** R124 (158r-v).

12 hexameters *Leonini*. Not edited. Walther 6463.

Festa celebrando carniprivalia, quando ...
Tot quia prebentur, fastidia longa sequentur.

At Carnival time the poet is torn: his mind wishes him to fast, but his senses rebel. Robert and Odo seem to be tempting the poet with a feast: they eat like Elias in the midst of famine.

There is no evidence to date this poem.

[17] **TO ODO:** R125 (158v).

6 lines in unrhymed elegiac couplets. Not edited. Walther 18481.

De Odone
Spera figurarum cum sis pulcherrima, finis ...
Extremo medium se dare dicet Odo.

Praise of Odo through manipulation of the letters of his palindromic name.

There is no evidence for place and date; perhaps Odo is the same person as the host of the feast in R124.

[18] **EPITAPH FOR MILO, BISHOP OF BEAUVAIS (1234):** R126 (158v).

14 lines in unrhymed elegiac couplets. Not edited; lines 1-2, 9-14 transcribed by Russell (*Master Henry*, p. 126). Walther 12794.

wanted Bishop Henry to introduce him (and that therefore R123 is prior to R118-120). This conclusion seems to be based on lines 11-12 (although Bund does not quote them in full):

Nobilis yconome, scripsi tibi carmina Rome;
Sifrido pro me nunc verba precancia prome.

It is clear that the poet wants Bishop Henry to intercede for him; but the Ovidian phrase 'verba precancia' need not imply an introduction to a person one has not met. Bund's second assumption is that Bishop Henry was already bishop when the poems were written for him at Rome. Finally, Bund assumes that 'Rome' must imply that the poems were written in the city of Rome, and not simply at the curia (see R118-120).

⁵⁰ Bund, 'Mittelrheinische Geschichte', 65-66; Auvray, *Les registres*, nos. 2381, 2397, 2415.

⁵¹ Bund, 'Mittelrheinische Geschichte', 65; Auvray, *Les registres*, no. 990. In a poem in A (probably by Henry of Avranches), the poet reminds the bishop of Durham of a similar favour: 'Allegavit enim pro te mea musa Donelmi / coram iudicibus ...' (R34, lines 21-22; Russell and Heironimus, *Shorter Latin Poems*, p. 93).

De Milone episcopo Beluacensi

O mors digna mori clarum clerique Milonem ...

Tale mori sit ei uita, perire salus.

Epitaph for Milo, duke and bishop and count of Beauvais. The king, deceived by envy, wished to deprive Milo of the duchy, so Milo went to the Apostolic see for help; he died *in reditu* (line 13).

Milo de Châtillon-Nanteuil, bishop of Beauvais, died 6 September 1234 at Camerino.⁵² Two years before, when Gregory IX put him in charge of the March of Ancona, several poems in A were dedicated to him.⁵³

Part B

[19] TRANSLATION OF SALISBURY CATHEDRAL: R20 (159r-162r).

208 lines in unrhymed elegiac couplets. Also in A; formerly in London, British Library Cotton Vitellius D.XIV, destroyed in the 1731 fire. Edited from D and A in Russell and Heironimus, *Shorter Latin Poems*, pp. 110-16. Walther 5216.

Mons Saltisberie (d Sarisbirie) quasi Gelboe mons maledictus ...

Presulis affectus, artificumque fides. Amen.

The poem begins with a description of the unpleasant conditions at Old Sarum: the wind, lack of water, and in particular the proximity of the cathedral precincts to the royal castle. Bishop Richard burned to free the clergy from this situation. The harmful effect of the surroundings at Old Sarum on the eyes, ears, heart, liberty, and breast is described. For these reasons bishop Richard decided to move the city; the old cathedral collapsed, lest there be any chance of moving back. He sought a new site, and found a pleasant valley (whose pastoral scenery is described at length). Here a new cathedral was begun; happy is he who shall live to see it finished! Let the king, the bishop and the masons all contribute to the work.

The new cathedral at Salisbury was begun in 1220, and the first congregation was held there in 1225.⁵⁴ Since bishop Richard Poore's successor is not mentioned, the poem was probably written before Richard's translation to Durham in 1228; a more precise date cannot be fixed. The poem may have been connected

⁵² Eubel, *Hierarchia*, p. 132; *MGH SS*, 23.936, line 35 (*Chronica Albrici monachi Trium Fontium*).

⁵³ R69, 72, 73, 78.

⁵⁴ Russell and Heironimus, *Shorter Latin Poems*, pp. 109-110.

with the fund-raising campaign launched by the bishop in 1219 and 1220 to raise money in neighbouring dioceses.⁵⁵

A copy of this poem is found in A; the two copies appear to agree in error in only one instance (line 114 'merces' for 'mentes'). There are substantial variants, notably D's omission of the opening couplet. Matthew Paris included a slightly altered version of one couplet in his *Chronica majora*⁵⁶ and wrote it into the margin in A (lines 208-209). A third copy was formerly in MS Cotton Vitellius D.XIV, along with several of the poems in A; the manuscript was destroyed in the 1731 fire.

[20] JOHN BLUND: R127 (162r-166r).

247 hexameters: lines 1-232 unrhymed, lines 233-247 *Leonini*. Edited in Russell and Heironimus, *Shorter Latin Poems*, pp. 129-36. Walther 17222.

Sancte pater, cuius discretio cismata mundi ...
Immo repulsabis fecte conuicia labis.

Addressed to the Pope. Holy Father, no one can decide this case but you. I am no mere hired advocate: my poverty is proof of that. If poetry were popular, I would be rich; but colour does not please the blind or songs the deaf. Therefore it is clear that I speak not for a price but out of an innate love of justice. You know the case: after Richard's death, a dispute arose between John and Simon. I speak for John. John's morals are praised; the absence of the prior of Dover does not invalidate the election; John studied at Paris and Oxford; if he committed any crime at Oxford, why have they not produced witnesses? Men of every nation knew John at Paris, and can testify to his conduct there. Although he is a pluralist, the church of England has always been tacitly dispensed from prohibitions of pluralism; in any case, the penalty for pluralism is not the loss of the new church but

⁵⁵ W. H. Rich Jones, ed., *Vetus registrum sarisberiense alias dictum Registrum s. Osmundi episcopi*, 2 vols. (RS 78; London 1883-84), 2.11-12. Russell argues that the poem was written after the dedication of altars in the new cathedral in 1225, because the old church is said to have collapsed:

Neve facultatem redeundi clerus haberet
posterus, ecclesie corruit aula vetus. (lines 137-138)

Russell's assumption that services were therefore being held in the new cathedral is unwarranted. A wooden chapel was built on the new site before the foundations of the cathedral were laid, and services were held there from 2 June 1219; the *transmigratio* to the new site was planned for 1 November of that year. There would be no need to keep the old church in good repair after this time. The chapel was of sufficient dignity that the Dean was buried there the following year, by which time the cathedral school had moved to the new city. See Jones, *Vetus registrum*, 2.10, 15-16. The old site seems therefore to have been abandoned almost immediately; we have no information about the date of the collapse of the old church.

⁵⁶ Matthew Paris, *Chronica majora*, ed. H. R. Luard, 7 vols. (RS 57; London, 1872-83), 3.189-90, 391.

of the old. The church is in dire straits, and has need of such a leader. Therefore, Holy Father, accept John and reject Simon.

John Blund was elected Archbishop of Canterbury in August 1232 and seems to have set out for Rome immediately after; the poem may be dated to late 1232.⁵⁷

[21] **BOURGES-BORDEAUX (1230 X 1232):** R128 (166r-168r).

133 hexameters *Leonini*. Edition in progress by Peter Binkley. Walther 14537.

Pressos erumpnis releuans ter quinque columnis ...
Digneris musas, et eis attendere plus has.

Addressed to Rome and to the Pope. The Archbishop of Bourges expounds the basis for his claim to primacy over Aquitaine, citing precedents and papal bulls. The objections of Bordeaux are scorned. The Archbishop does not cite canon law to the Pope, for that would be like showing the sun with a lamp. Let the cantor be the *iudex vocalis*, you the *iudex realis*. Flower of precentors, attend more to the muses than to the poets!

The dispute over the primacy of Aquitaine came to the attention of the curia in 1211, and was aggravated in 1215 when the Archbishop of Bourges was ambushed by the Bishop of Poitiers while attempting a visitation of the province of Bordeaux. The Archbishop of Bordeaux was contumacious, and the lawsuit dragged on until Gregory IX imposed a settlement in March 1232. This date is the *terminus ad quem*. A *terminus a quo* may be derived from R68, a stanzaic poem in A dealing with the same case: it is probably a stanzaic introduction to R128, similar to the stanzaic introduction to the versification of *Generation and Corruption*.⁵⁸ In this poem the Archbishop of Bordeaux is named: Geraud de Malemort, elected December 1227. He began his pontificate by making peace with Bourges, but the dispute broke out again when Geraud refused to attend a council at Bourges in 1228, leading to the revival of the charges before the curia.⁵⁹ R68 stresses Geraud's tricks, contumacity, audacity and disobedience: these are probably references to Geraud's actions in 1230, when he fled from the curia pleading that he need not answer the charges of the Archbishop of Bourges because he had been summoned for another business, and therefore must be summoned again as if absent;⁶⁰ later, at Bordeaux, Geraud's men prevented the Abbot of Aigues-Vives from delivering

⁵⁷ Russell and Heironimus, *Shorter Latin Poems*, pp. 127-29; Matthew Paris, *Chronica maiora* 3.223, 243-44; 5.41.

⁵⁸ R35: see Russell and Heironimus, *Shorter Latin Poems*, pp. 101-104.

⁵⁹ Auvray, *Les registres*, no. 353.

⁶⁰ Auvray, *Les registres*, no. 488; the case was included in the *Decretales* of Gregory IX, X.2.8.4.

the summons by thrashing him with sticks.⁶¹ Thus, both R68 and R128 were written between late 1230 and March 1232.⁶²

The closing lines of this piece indicate that it is an entry in a poetry contest conducted as a mock trial. The judgement for this trial may survive in A: R33, in which a judge decides between Henry and Peter.⁶³ He orders that the documents be given to the Pope and curia, for his job is to judge the poetry:

Cessent hac parte monstrari carmina; carte
Pape tradantur et eis quibus omnia dantur.
Versibus auditis tantum dabo (*altered to date by d*) premia litis. ...
Iudicium dono: Normanni scripta corono;
Sufficiat petro secum contendere metro (A 154r).

A substantial passage from R128 was adapted by Michael of Cornwall.⁶⁴

[22] **BORDO-SILER:** R129-144 (168r-176v).

452 lines: hexameters, except lines 29-39, which are in elegiac couplets; lines 1-28: *Caudati* in couplets; 29-39: *collaterales*; 40-342: *Leonini*; 343-452: *Unisoni* in 'ere'. Edition in progress by A. G. Rigg; lines 1-2 transcribed by Russell (*Master Henry*, p. 80); lines 181, 339-342 (*Master Henry*, p. 168); lines 76-78 (*Master Henry*, p. 170); Walther nos.: R129: 14037; R130: 406; R131: 4579; R132: 5604; R133: 12490; R134: 6545; R135: 8815; R136: 18423; R137: 2086; R138: 2227; R139: 15831; R140: 14023; R141: 19064; R142: 7451; R143: 4135; R144: 16624.

Petre Siler, quasi (*corr. from* qui) petra sile iam, noster Homere ...
Quin meus⁶⁵ atterere uelit impetus ora chimere.

This is one side of a flyting, similar to that of Michael of Cornwall, against Peter Siler and Jean Bordo. Bordo is known to have been a canon of Angers;⁶⁶ Siler has

⁶¹ Auvray, *Les registres*, no. 702.

⁶² For a general account of the conflict see G. Devailly, *Le Berry du X^e siècle au milieu du XIII^e. Étude politique, religieuse, sociale et économique* (Paris, 1973), pp. 501-503; Y. Renouard et al., *Bordeaux sous les rois d'Angleterre (Histoire de Bordeaux)*, ed. C. Higounet, 3; Bordeaux, 1965), pp. 138-140; L. de Lacger, 'La primatie et le pouvoir métropolitain de l'archevêque de Bourges au XIII^e siècle', *Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique* 26 (1930) 43-65, 269-330.

⁶³ A, fol. 154r; see Townsend and Rigg, 'Medieval Latin Poetic Anthologies (V)', 374. The scribe left the last eleven lines of D fol. 168r blank, perhaps to take an ending (although R33 would be too long).

⁶⁴ Cf. R128, lines 117-128 (fol. 168r) with Michael, lines 447-456. See my forthcoming edition of R128.

⁶⁵ Quin meus: Quin omnes D; Quin *altered to* Quis d.

⁶⁶ Joannes Bordum, subdeacon and canon of Angers, was described in his obituary as 'dictator et versificator egregius'; he is credited with an epitaph for Michael de Villoiseau's predecessor, bishop William de Beaumont, who died in 1240 (C. Urseau, *L'Obituaire de la Cathédrale d'Angers* [Documents historiques sur l'Anjou 7; Angers, 1930], pp. 25-26, 31-32).

left no trace. The contest is to be judged by Michael de Villeoiseau, bishop of Angers. The nature of the work resists easy compression; suffice it to say that the poet defends himself against a wide variety of charges, and levies several of his own, especially playing on the names Siler and Bordo.

The episcopate of Michael de Villeoiseau limits the poem to between 1240 and 1260;⁶⁷ if the author is Henry of Avranches, then the periods when Henry is known to have been in England must be barred (1243-45, 1251-62).⁶⁸ Henry wrote a poem in honour of the Crown of Thorns at Paris in the early 1240s.⁶⁹ Several lines and images were borrowed from this poem by Henry's student Michael of Cornwall.⁷⁰

[23] WILLIAM OF LAVAL: R145 (176v-177r).

40 lines: lines 1-10 elegiac couplets *collaterales*, the rest hexameters: 11-14 *Unisoni* in '-eco'; 15-19 *Unisoni* in '-ia'; 20-25 *Unisoni* in '-eri'; 26-33 *Unisoni* in '-onis'; 34-40 *Unisoni* in '-icis'. A leaf is missing after fol. 176; therefore approximately 56 lines are missing after line 14.⁷¹ Walther 12275. Edition in progress by Peter Binkley; lines 31-34 transcribed by Russell (*Master Henry*, p. 124).

Nos tua barbaries dampnat, Willelme, latinos ...
Stercora (MS Sstercora) qui metricis dicendo te michi dicis.

Another flying. Here the opponent is William, who is accused (among other things) of obtaining Laval ('Vallis Guidonis', in the diocese of Le Mans) by simony.

One William, dean of Laval, issued a document in 1241; he was possibly still in office in 1243, but had been replaced by Pierre de Lamarie by November 1246.⁷²

⁶⁷ Eubel, *Hierarchia*, p. 88.

⁶⁸ Russell and Heironimus, *Shorter Latin Poems*, p. 140; Russell, 'Master Henry', 50-51, 55-58.

⁶⁹ R14, attributed to Henry in the manuscript (see Townsend and Rigg, 'Medieval Latin Poetic Anthologies [V]', 363); an edition is forthcoming from D. Townsend.

⁷⁰ E.g. cf. Bordo 133-34 (fol. 170v) with Michael 143-44; Bordo 24, 27-28 (fol. 168v) with Michael 308-310; Bordo 197 (fol. 172r) with Michael 463; Bordo 306 (fol. 174r) with Michael 680; Bordo 29 (fol. 169r) with Michael 688; etc. See A. G. Rigg's forthcoming edition of the Bordo debate.

⁷¹ The evidence for the missing leaves here and after fol. 184 is textual. In R145, every change of rhyme scheme is marked by a two-line initial, except for the change that occurs at the top of fol. 177r; there is no lapse in syntax, as this is the beginning of a sentence. R156 breaks off at the bottom of fol. 184v, leaving the last stanza metrically deficient; probably more than one stanza has been lost.

⁷² E. Laurain, 'Anciens quartiers de Laval', *Bulletin de la commission historique et archéologique de la Mayenne*, 2nd Ser., 20 (1904) 173-75; B. de Broussillon, 'La maison de Laval. Cartulaire de Laval et de Vitré. Emma (Suite)', *Bulletin de la commission historique et archéologique de la Mayenne*, 2nd Ser., 10 (1895) 267, item 428; cf. pp. 281-82, items 439 and 442. There is no basis for Russell's identification of William with a certain knight, William of Coulaines: see Russell, *Master*

This poem is similar in style to the Bordo-Siler flyting (R129-144), and is from the same area and probably the same period; like the Bordo-Siler poem it was borrowed from by Michael of Cornwall (cf. R145 lines 3-6 with Michael lines 691-694; lines 17-19 with Michael 649-650).

[24] **FULK BASSET, BISHOP OF LONDON: R146 (177v-178r).**

36 lines in unrhymed elegiac couplets. Edited by Russell and Heironimus, *Shorter Latin Poems* pp. 144-45. Walther 16277. An early modern hand has noted in the margin: *Ad Fulconem Basset Episcopum Lond: Anno 1244*

Quod michi Fulconis de nobilitate uidetur ...
Est hec urbs, ergo maximus iste pater.

I shall not say what I know of Fulk's nobility, for it is foolish to teach what is manifest; instead, I shall explain his names, each of which expresses the burden of the bishop's office. 'Fulk' is from *fulcamen* 'support', 'Basset' from *bas situs* 'set low', as Fulk is the foundation of the church; but now he is set high as a falcon ('nunc "haut" situs est quasi falco', line 26); he was night, now he is day; he was rock, now metal; he was the foot, now the head; he was the foundation, now the dome; therefore London ought to honour such a bishop.

Fulk Basset was elected bishop of London in December 1241, but because of royal opposition he was not consecrated until 9 October 1244; he died in May 1259.⁷³ Although Russell hesitated to assign a date to the poem,⁷⁴ it seems clear from the emphasis on Fulk's change of status and from the odd phrase 'pontificis hodierni' (line 5) that the poem was written for the day of Fulk's consecration. The poet uses French 'bas' and 'haut' in his word-play (line 26).

[25] **DIETRICH OF WIED, ARCHBISHOP OF TRIER (1239 X 1242): R147 (178r-v).**

45 lines in elegiac couplets, *collaterales*. Not edited. Walther 14406.

Predita reliquiis, patrum Treuir inclita sedes ...
Precipuas, in eo tot reperire potes.

(To the city of Trier). Archbishop Dietrich has protected Trier with four castles, two that he repaired and two that he built: Grimburg to the south, Kyllburg to the north, Saarburch to the west and Mount Tabor to the east. The poet has seen only

Henry; pp. 124-25, where the phrase 'bos preesse volendo colonis' (line 30: fol. 177r) is made to yield the place-name 'Colonia' (Coulaines).

⁷³ J. le Neve, *Fasti Ecclesiae Anglicanae 1066-1300*, comp. D. E. Greenway, 3 vols. to date (London, 1968-77) 1.3; Matthew Paris, *Chronica maiora* 4.171, 393.

⁷⁴ Russell and Heironimus, *Shorter Latin Poems*, p. 143.

Mount Tabor, which he praises lavishly for its strength, pleasant location, and inhabitants.

The date is indicated by the mention of Kyllburg, which was begun in 1239 by Dietrich of Wied, archbishop of Trier.⁷⁵ The name of the castle has been hidden by the scribe of D, who was evidently not familiar with German place names:

Grimbroch (*sic*) prospiciunt ex austro qui maduere (*sic*);⁷⁶
 A <Ky>leborch (MS *Aquile borch*) fugiunt magna minorque fere.⁷⁷
 Subiectos zefiris Sareborch ad prelia queret,
 Oppositisque uiris Mons Tabor arma feret. (lines 7-10)

A *terminus ante quem* is provided by the death of Dietrich in March 1242.⁷⁸

[26] FUNERAL OF ROBERT PASSELEWE: R148-149 (179r-v).

3 rhythmic stanzas of 8x8pp rhymed ababbaab (R148); 22 lines in unrhymed elegiac couplets (R149). Edited by Russell and Heironimus (*Shorter Latin Poems*, pp. 146-48). R148: Walther 2378; R149 is not in Walther.

Cantatus michi tociens / nunc quoque carmen exigit ...
 Patet expressa ratio / Nominis et cogn<ominis>.

Nullus aque, nullus peccati terminus in se est ...
 <Carm>ina quas hodie multisonora canunt.

(R148) A song is required of me: Robert who traverses waters ('aquas transiens' = Passelewe) has reached the port of salvation. Robert is 'robur thus': strength of judgement, incense of sacrifice. He has crossed the flood of sin to the bank of the river. (R149) Water is a metaphor for sin. Now Robert has crossed the waters, for he has left sin. Robert is 'robur thus'. Thus things underlie the names, mysteries underlie the things that today these songs celebrate.

Robert Passelewe, the prominent courtier, died on 6 June 1252;⁷⁹ this poem was written for his funeral. The two parts are best treated as a single unit, with a stanzaic prologue and a metrical body (like R35 Generation and Corruption and R68 and R128 Bourges/Bordeaux). Though the two parts deal with the same imagery, they are not repetitive: new ideas are introduced. It is possible that the gift of 100 shillings ordered by the king to be paid to Henry of Avranches on 15

⁷⁵ P. B. Pixton, *Dietrich of Wied, Archbishop of Trier, 1212-1242: A Study of Princely Politics and Religious Reform* (Diss. University of Iowa, 1972), pp. 151-52; cf. *MGH SS* 24.403 (ed. G. Waitz, *Gestorum Treverorum Continuatio IV*), where the form 'Kyleburch' is used (line 30).

⁷⁶ Perhaps translate: 'Those who have sweated their way from the South see Grimburg.'

⁷⁷ That is, Ursa Major and Ursa Minor.

⁷⁸ Eubel, *Hierarchia*, p. 495.

⁷⁹ Russell and Heironimus, *Shorter Latin Poems*, p. 144; Matthew Paris, *Chronica majora* 5.299.

June 1252 for his expenses (nine days after Robert's death) was a payment for this poem.⁸⁰

[27] **EASTER VACATION:** R150 (179v).

10 rhythmic stanzas of 2x(8p+8p+7pp) rhymed aabaab ('Stabat mater' stanzas). Edited by Peter Binkley in 'Two Thirteenth-Century Latin *Ferienlieder*', *Scintilla. A Student Journal for Medievalists* (Toronto) 5 (1988) 29-32. Walther 14477 ('Presul...').

<...>nis uir preclare / cuius sensus tamquam mare ...
nobis fiant displicine / uergentes in tedium. Amen.

Students ask their master to suspend lectures for Easter, arguing that they are too weak from fasting to attend school, and should be allowed to see their families and receive communion.

These *Ferienlieder* are of a common enough type.⁸¹ P. G. Schmidt has argued that they developed from the *festum baculi*.⁸²

[28] **CHRISTMAS VACATION:** R151 (180r).

13 stanzas (as in no. 150). Edited by Binkley, '*Ferienlieder*', 33-36. Walther 8821.

<I>n aduentu redemptoris / qui peccatum transgressoris
... tam mundana quam diuina / libertatem petimus.

A similar poem to R150, but for the Christmas vacation. Amid praise of their master, the students mock Jews for not believing in the incarnation, and point out that Christ came to return exiles to their homeland; therefore the master should not keep his students at school.

[29] **CONRADUS DE HEIMBACH:** R152 (180v-181r).

49 unrhymed hexameters. Not edited; lines 28-30 transcribed by Russell (*Master Henry*, p. 80). Walther 13387.

<O>ppressum morbis consolaturus amicum ...
Fortiter illa premit, et tu preme fortius illum.

⁸⁰ *CLibR* 1251-60, p. 54.

⁸¹ See especially *Analecta hymnica Medii Aevi* 45b.79-92 for several verses from Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale lat. 11412; *The 'Parisiana Poetria' of John of Garland*, ed. and tr. T. Lawler (New Haven and London, 1974), pp. 188-90; and M. L. Colker, 'Several Mediaeval Latin Poems Unrecorded in Hans Walther', *Classica et mediaevalia* 36 (1985) 242-45 (where a Christmas poem in praise of two school-masters of Vercelli is probably related to this type: although the students do not ask for a vacation, they stress the giving of gifts to their masters).

⁸² P. G. Schmidt, 'Das Zitat in der Vagantendichtung. Bakelfest und Vagantenstrophe cum auctoritate', *Antike und Abendland* 20 (1974) 82.

The poet seeks to console his sick friend Conrad of Heimbach: he cannot offer medicine for the body, only poetry for the soul. He therefore describes Conrad's name (Heimbach = 'rius mansi uel mansio riui', line 30; Conradus = 'audax consilium', line 39).

I have found no record of Conrad of Heimbach.

[30] **WILLIAM RALEIGH, BISHOP OF WINCHESTER (1244):** R153 (181r-v).

12 hexameters *collaterales*. Edited by Russell and Heironimus, *Shorter Latin Poems*, pp. 145-46. Walther 14476. An early modern hand has noted in the margin: *Ad Willielmum Raley Episcopum Wynton. Anno 1243.*

Presul Wintonie, cleri Wi<ll>el<me> lucerna ...
Percipienda prius patris est benedictio tanti.

William, bishop of Winchester, today ancient probity rejoices that you have triumphed. If anyone seeks probity in you, they will find it, but in the others it has fled. I know this, for I am poorer than Codrus; not art nor reason nor poetry profits me. But you are heir of the ancients, you keep to the praises of Peter. Hence it will go better for me as I prepare for a journey if I receive the blessing of such a father.

Russell placed the poem after William's return to England, following his dispute with the king.⁸³ William was confirmed to the see of Winchester 17 September 1243, and was consecrated sometime after the king's appeal to the papal curia was dismissed, in February 1244; he died before 1 September 1250 at Tours, having been there for eleven months.⁸⁴ The poem would seem to fit with the time of his consecration (probably in mid-1244), for it was written for an occasion (*hodie*) and William is compared with others who do not measure up to his standard: that is, his defeated rivals.

[31] **WILLIAM OF YORK, BISHOP OF SALISBURY:** R154 (181v-182r).

27 hexameters *Leonini*. Edited by Russell and Heironimus, *Shorter Latin Poems*, p. 146. Walther 19094. An early modern hand has noted in the margin: *Gul. de Eboraco Sarum. Anno 1247.*

Te, Willelme, quidem, qui flos et fructus es idem ...
Set michi stat misere, qui semper cogor egere.

The poet praises William of York, bishop of Salisbury, on the occasion of his showing hospitality to the king and court. The bishop's happy fortune in dining frequently with the king is contrasted with the poet's poverty.

⁸³ After 5 April 1244 (Russell and Heironimus, *Shorter Latin Poems*, p. 144; Russell, *Master Henry*, pp. 133-34).

⁸⁴ Le Neve, *Fasti Ecclesiae Anglicanae 1066-1300* 2.86; Matthew Paris, *Chronica maiora* 5.178-9.

William of York, bishop of Salisbury from 1247 to 1256, had been a courtier, and at the time of his death was still counted among the 'familiar[es] regis et reginae' by Matthew Paris.⁸⁵ A likely date for the poem is the summer of 1249, the only time in William's pontificate when the king gave gifts to Salisbury Cathedral.⁸⁶ The king was at Clarendon (outside Salisbury) in early June.⁸⁷

[32] **PETER DES ROCHES, BISHOP OF WINCHESTER: R155 (182r-v).**

41 hexameters *Leonini*. Edited by Russell and Heironimus, *Shorter Latin Poems*, pp. 125-26. Walther 12859. An early modern hand has noted in the margin: *Ad Petrum de la Roche siue de Rupibus, Episcopum Wynton*.

<O> Petre de Saxis, qui cleri summus es ac sis ...
 premia magna feres sua, si mea non retineres.

To Peter des Roches (*de Rupibus*), bishop of Winchester. His names both mean stone: he is foundation and capstone. The walls of Jerusalem rejoice that the fates prepare such a stone for them. You are rigid as a stone: I would make you less so, but I have no vinegar and goat's blood.⁸⁸ St. Birin will supply these, for I wrote his deeds for you: you will receive a great reward from him if you do not deny me my reward.

Peter des Roches was bishop of Salisbury from 1205 until his death on 9 June 1238. This poem apparently refers to the Life of St. Birin (R23) attributed to Henry of Avranches.⁸⁹ Russell argued that the mention of the walls of Jerusalem indicates that the poem was written shortly before Peter's departure on crusade in 1227; this may, however, be a reference to the heavenly Jerusalem.⁹⁰

[33] **FEAST OF HOLY TRINITY: R156 (183r-184r).**

62 lines in unrhymed elegiac couplets (two pentameters were omitted by the scribe: lines 26 and 31). The text is badly damaged, and much of it is illegible. Not edited. Walther 5007.

Dum uolo presentis epitheta retexere fest<i> ...
 Sufficit in uobis forte; probabo tamen.

⁸⁵ Matthew Paris, *Chronica maiora* 5.534; Eubel, *Hierarchia*, p. 435.

⁸⁶ *CCR* 1247-51, pp. 143, 166, 201.

⁸⁷ *CLibR* 1245-51, pp. 237-39; *CCR* 1247-51, pp. 167-72; *CPR* 1247-58, p. 43.

⁸⁸ See Pliny, *Historia naturalis* 20.2 and 27.57.

⁸⁹ D. R. Townsend, *An Edition of Saints' Lives Attributed to Henry of Avranches* (Diss. Toronto, 1985), pp. 163-95.

⁹⁰ Russell and Heironimus, *Shorter Latin Poems*, p. 124; Townsend, *An Edition of Saints' Lives*, p. 154.

A rumination on the persons of the Trinity, written for Trinity Sunday (although the poet avoids the word *trinitas*; see R122 above). The context is hinted at in the closing lines:

Mens, animus, ratio: sic tres nichilominus vnam
Dicimus hinc animam. Sic fit ymago Dei,
Esse tenebamur similes; hoc deficit in me,
Sufficit in uobis — forte: probabo tamen.

It was the custom in the London schools on important holidays for the master to take his students to the appropriate church and hold competitions.⁹¹ This poem would seem to be a sort of magisterial sermon on such an occasion. If this poem comes from the same period as the other poems in the manuscript, it was probably written in northern France or England, since the feast of the Trinity was not yet widespread in Germany or Italy.⁹²

[34] FEAST OF JOHN THE BAPTIST: R157 (184r-v).

21 unrhymed hexameters. Much of the text is illegible. Not edited. Walther 14400.

Precursor domini pre iudice missus in orbem (*corr. from urbem*) ...
Vt cancer gre<ss>us <.....> noscor.

Apparently an occasional piece for a feast on the Nativity of John the Baptist. After an account of John's distinctions, the poet refers to the occasion for the poem (the text is damaged):

Neue quid impediāt hodierni gaudia festi,
Procuratorem te constituisse uidetur:
Eius agis, W<illelme> <.....>
Omnes exhyllarans, et e<go> lasciuior essem
Omnibus hiis, set me ... (lines 14-18)

The division between this poem and the next has not previously been noted.

[35] FEAST OF THE ASSUMPTION: R157a (184v).

14 lines in elegiac couplets, *Leonini*. Much of the text is illegible. Not edited. Not in Walther. In Russell's list this poem is subsumed in R157.

⁹¹ William Fitzstephen, *Vita sancti Thomae Cantuariensis archiepiscopi et martyris*, ed. J. C. Robertson (RS 67.3; London, 1877; rpt. Wiesbaden, 1965), pp. 4-5.

⁹² Although this feast was not approved for the universal church until the time of John xxii, it was in use in northern France and Normandy in the eleventh century, and in England in the twelfth. See P. Browe, 'Zur Geschichte des Dreifaltigkeitsfestes', *Archiv für Liturgiewissenschaft* 1 (1950) 65-81.

Annua s<u>nt hod<i>e mundo celebranda Marie ...
 <P>reter quam humus (MS sumus) umbra fumusque sumus.

A call to celebrate the Feast of the Assumption of the Virgin. This may be another classroom piece, for it contains the expression 'gaudet u<t>raque scola' (line 8); unfortunately the context is too badly damaged to allow us to be sure what the poet had in mind.

[36] **CENSORES DELEGATI:** R158 (184v).

3 rhythmic stanzas of 4x8pp+7p rhymed aaaab aaaab cccc... The last line of the last stanza is missing; one leaf is missing after fol. 184 (see above, note 71). Waltham 12538.

O censores delegati / quorum subest potestati ...
 ... turba iuris peritorum / turbat iura, perdit forum...
 (incomplete)

Addressed to judges. O judges delegate, in whose power whatever we have exchanged ('quicquid sumus alternati') lies, it is commanded by the world that the tribunal should allow it. All advocates, whether hired or asked, oppose truth; thus the right is with us. If their words and rhetorical colours move you, then the crowd of lawyers confounds the law and destroys the court...

This is probably the epilogue of an entry in a poetry contest in the form of a mock trial, such as R128 above (q.v.). This poem is written as prose, like R104.

The Question of Authorship

Ascription

There are no contemporary notations of authorship in the manuscript. Richard James's ascription to Michael of Cornwall on fol. 151r appears to be conjecture, perhaps based on the extensive passages borrowed by Michael from poems in this manuscript, or perhaps simply on the general similarity of the Bordo-Siler debate (the longest piece in the manuscript) to Michael's work. There is no indication of authorship in Henry Savile's catalogue.

The reference to Avranches in the Bordo/Siler debate might be an internal indication of Henry's authorship: '...Cenomannia, quam reuereri / Debeat Abrincas' (lines 341-342). Russell took R123 to contain a reference to Henry as author, but this is wrong (see above ad loc.).

Connections with Ascribed Poems

R122, in which the poet asks the pope to release certain *nomina sacra* from the rules of prosody, must relate to the unquestionably authentic *Vita sancti Francisci*, and therefore must surely derive from Henry's pen.

Connections with the Known Career of Henry of Avranches

The Bordo/Siler debate, the William of Laval debate, and the Bourges/Bordeaux debate are all similar to the sort of poetry contest in which Henry is known to have engaged, as his contests with Michael of Cornwall demonstrate. One of the few poems expressly ascribed to Henry in A is a versification of Aristotle's *De generatione et corruptione*, which was written as an entry in a competition at a university.⁹³

Henry is known to have been a grammar-master engaged in the teaching of versification;⁹⁴ the Trinity poem (R156) is therefore the sort of thing he would have written, and the *Ferienlieder* (R150, 151) might be either the work of his students or his own compositions intended as models. We know from the anecdote about the *Vita sancti Francisci* (see R122) that Henry was at the papal court at least once between about 1228 and the death of Gregory IX in 1241, the period in which the papal court poems in this manuscript were written (R108, 111-120, 122, 126-128). English records demonstrate his presence in England in the 1240s and the 1250s, when most of the poems for English patrons were written (R146, 148-149, 153, 154).⁹⁵

Connections with A

The other great collection of Henry's poetry is in Cambridge, University Library Dd.11.78 (A). As in D there is much difficulty in establishing authorship of individual poems; but there is no question that much of the material in A is

⁹³ R35; the prologue is edited in Russell and Heironimus, *Shorter Latin Poems*, pp. 102-104; an edition is forthcoming from Anna Kirkwood.

⁹⁴ Cf. Michael lines 191 ff. and especially lines 261-74:

Et procul et propius iam Francus et Anglicus eque	
Norunt, Parisius quid feceris Oxonieque.	
Nec proprie fateor, quid feceris, immo fatendum	
Verius esse reor, quid finxeris ad faciendum.	
Pactus eras multa te multos posse docere,	265
Multimoda multa multari dignus, et e re	
Tot promisisti, quot nunquam promere quibus.	
Vix evasisti, sed non in pace redibis.	
Artem dictandi vis Anglos discere de te,	
Et plus dictant hii quam tales mille poete	270
Et melius noscunt, que dicunt, arte probare.	
Qui merito poscunt: quod spondes voce, proba re!	
Totus es et nullus: totus, quia tot bona spondens,	
Sed potius nullus, quia prorsus nil bene condens.	

Note that the 'ars dictandi' in line 269 is not the academic *ars dictaminis*, as Russell supposed (Russell and Heironimus, *Shorter Latin Poems*, p. 155), but rather poetic composition, as the context makes plain.

⁹⁵ See above, note 68.

Henry's.⁹⁶ The two collections have in common R20 (Salisbury Cathedral), although the texts vary. They also seem to have divided between them the two parts of the Bourges/Bordeaux debate (R68 in A and R128 in D).

Occasional verse in the two manuscripts clearly comes from the same milieu. Several poems in A accord with poems in D in place and time of composition. R20 (which occurs in both manuscripts) was written in England in the 1220's, as were, for example, R2, 34 etc. in A. R10-12 were written in Italy probably in 1234, when Frederick II visited the curia at Rieti; R69, 72, 73 and 78 deal with Milo of Beauvais and his service to the Pope in the Duchy of Spoleto and the March of Ancona in the early 1230s, and were probably written at the curia.⁹⁷ R14 in A, one of the poems ascribed to Henry, deals with events in Paris in 1241; the Bordo poems in D were written at Angers in the 1240s or 1250s, and R145 deals with the diocese of Le Mans perhaps in the early 1240s. Several patrons are addressed in both manuscripts: Milo of Beauvais (A: R69, 72, 73, 78; D: R126), Peter des Roches (A: R23; D: R155), Robert Passelewe (A: R36, 77; D: R148, 149), and Gregory IX (A: R89 *Vita sancti Francisci*; D: R122). Of course, of the poems in A listed here, only R14 and R89 are expressly ascribed to Henry; but the cumulative weight of these common dates, places and patrons, and especially of patrons as obscure and distant as Milo and Robert, increases the likelihood that both manuscripts were compiled from the works of a single poet.

Some fairly specialized concerns are found in poems in both manuscripts. The fate of the Everardini is deplored by the author of R79 in A and the Siegfried poems in D (R118-120).

There are many verbal parallels between otherwise unrelated poems in the two manuscripts. Similar rhetorical etymologies of the name 'Robertus' appear.⁹⁸ The imagery of Icarus, Phaethon, and the fabled tortoise who wanted to fly occurs in both manuscripts, in related passages:

Bordo 299 ff. (D fol. 173v):

Nonne times sperni currus auriga superni?

Cur insidis equo quem nescis ducere de quo

Nec dum scis, Pheton, an sit Pirous an Ethon?

⁹⁶ See Townsend and Rigg, 'Medieval Latin Poetic Anthologies (V)'. Poems securely attributable to Henry fill one third of this codex (R14, 23, 35, 41b, 48, and 89 cover 166 of the manuscript's 478 pages), while there is good evidence for his authorship of several other poems in the manuscript (R1, 2, 10-12, 19, 22, 24, and 30: 168 pages).

⁹⁷ Milo was nominated Rector of the Duchy of Spoleto and the March of Ancona in September 1230; he was relieved of these offices in 1232. The poems, which are addressed to Milo and take his side, deal with the accusations of abuse which eventually led to Milo's replacement, and were therefore written in late 1231 or 1232. See Waley, *The Papal State*, pp. 138-39, 312, 314.

⁹⁸ In D: R148 line 11, R149 line 15: Robur-thus (Russell and Heironimus, *Shorter Latin Poems*, pp. 147-48). In A: R4, (fol. 29v), line 1 Robur-thus; line 7 Ros-ver-thus; R36 line 4 Ros-ver-thus (*Shorter Latin Poems*, p. 95); cf. R46 lines 5-6 (A fol. 173v) Engelbertus = Angelus-ver-thus.

Ycare, dic quare, quare testudo uolare
Appetis ut recidas? Dum fas est, uote recidas.

R78 25 ff. (A fol. 195r):

Terris prelatus et ad infima precipitatus
Ycarus Ycareas nomine reddet (aquas *expunct.*) eas.
Tunc poterit sperni currus auriga paterni
Ignorans Pheton inter equos quis Ethon.
Nosque sinet scire testudo, que nequit ire,
Quando uolare uolet qua leuitate uolet,
Et quanto peius factum processerit eius
Plus erit ingenua laus tua laude sua ...

(Cf. R73/67 ff.: A fol. 193r). These passages indicate that the poems are related; in light of Michael's borrowings, however, it is not safe to conclude on this basis alone that the poems have a common author (see below). Finally, the form 'Ruppis', to which Matthew Paris drew attention in A as characteristic of Norman pronunciation,⁹⁹ occurs in D as well: R155 line 26 'ruppes' and line 34 'ruppibus' (fol. 182v);¹⁰⁰ Henry is identified as a Norman by Michael.

If the common authorship of the poems in A and D is accepted, it may be that the two manuscripts are related. A was compiled by Matthew Paris over a number of years by an accretive process, binding booklets together, inserting quires and filling empty leaves with new texts as they came to hand. Part IV(c) in particular carries material related to poems in D, compiled in no particular order.¹⁰¹ It seems possible, therefore, that the two manuscripts were compiled by a similar process by someone who had access to Henry's works when these were in a disordered state, probably unbound. If this is the case, it is remarkable that there is only one item copied in both manuscripts (R20); this may indicate that A and D were planned as complementary volumes.

Borrowings by Michael

Michael of Cornwall adapted substantial passages from three debate poems in D: Bourges/Bordeaux (R128), Bordo/Siler (R129-144), and William of Laval (R145), and perhaps the pun on Hugo from R108 (see above). Michael seems also to have adapted an etymology of the name 'Henry' from a poem in A (R11 line 70): see Michael line 247 and Hilka's note.

⁹⁹ R78, line 7 (A fol. 194v): Matthew marked the word 'Ruppis' and wrote in the margin 'sic dicit omnis neuster'. Two pages earlier in R25, where 'sagittam' rhymes with 'inauditam' and 'uitam', Matthew noted 'neuster dicit sagitam' (A fol. 193v). Note that Matthew is referring to the author's spelling and not just the scribe's, for this section of the manuscript is in Matthew's own hand.

¹⁰⁰ But lines 14 and 15: 'rupes'. See Russell and Heironimus, *Shorter Latin Poems*, p. 126, where the form in line 34 is noted in the apparatus; the 'Norman' form in line 26 is overlooked.

¹⁰¹ See Townsend and Rigg, 'Medieval Latin Poetic Anthologies (V)', 368-69, 379-84.

There is substantial evidence that these poems are not Michael's. In the Bordo/Siler poem, the judge is named Michael, but the poet does not take advantage of their shared name; he seems, however, to allude to his identification with Avranches (see p. 000 above). The poet in the Bordo/Siler debate defends himself against some of the same charges that Michael makes against Henry: blindness, wandering, wine-drinking, etc. Michael refers to himself as *puer* to Henry's *vir* in their debates, written in the mid-1250s (Michael line 34); it therefore seems unlikely that he could have been active at the papal curia in the early 1230s when the Bourges/Bordeaux debate (R128) was written. Most convincing is the difference in the quality of the Latin composition in Michael's debate with Henry as against the poems in D.¹⁰² The poems in D, like Henry's other work, have a more refined Latin style, and do not attempt the dense rhyme-schemes in which Michael revels.

In favour of Henry's authorship of the poems from which Michael borrowed are the charges of plagiarism which Henry brought against Michael and which provide the whole legal framework for their debate. Michael devotes much of his effort to denying these charges (Michael lines 96-107; 328-334; etc.); he turns the charge around, claiming that Henry and an accomplice broke Michael's strongbox and stole a book of verses (Michael, lines 389-397; 751-759). In the context of a flyting these charges cannot of course be taken at face value; they indicate, however, that plagiarism is a concern of these poets. In this milieu, common passages cannot be assumed to indicate common authorship. In two cases, Michael has adapted and improved the passages he borrows: the passage from the Bourges-Bordeaux debate is transformed from *Leonini* to *collaterales*, the passage from the William of Laval debate from elegiac couplets to hexameters. His intention may have been to provoke Henry by flirting with plagiarism while creating a margin of difference, thus securing a defence based on superior ability: he has taken that same material and made something more elaborate of it.

Michael was Henry's student (Michael, lines 279, 723-724). His use of his master's works is therefore evidence of Henry's use of his own works as teaching texts. It may be significant that the three poems used by Michael are grouped together in D: they may represent Henry's own arrangement for the classroom.

¹⁰² Michael wrote a Latin much influenced by the vernacular. A full stylistic comparison is not possible here, but an indication of the sort of thing such a comparison would bring to light is provided by this simple computer-produced statistic: prepositions are used in Michael's work nearly twice as frequently as in the Bordo/Siler debate, although the two flytings are similar in tone and content (Bordo-Siler: 17.3 prepositions per 100 lines; Michael: 32.8 per 100 lines).

Caveat

An alternative explanation for some of these points may be advanced. Henry is known to have travelled 'velud explorando poetas' (Michael, line 677); Bordo made the same charge, and was answered thus:

Soliuagum minime socialem, Bordo, tibi me
Dicis. Concedo nec in hoc delinquere credo.
Vt meritis fame per secula lauder et a me
Discatis scioli michi nota poemata soli,
Que minus attente didicistis, meque docente
Vt sapiant homines terrarum uisito fines (R128-144 lines 165-170, fol. 171r-v).

The collection in D may therefore represent poems collected by Henry but not written by him. This would account for the geographical and temporal unity of the collection (since Henry could have collected occasional poems at the papal curia as easily as written them there), and for Michael's borrowings (since, as the Bordo/Siler poems imply, one purpose for collecting poetry is to use it in teaching). Against this is the relative lack of anomalies in the collections in A and D: Henry must have collected only freshly-written occasional verse, or we would find, for example, papal court poems from the early and mid-1220's, when the evidence of the saints' lives and other poems place Henry in England.¹⁰³ There is also the consistency of style and language in the occasional verse.

Conclusions

Henry's authorship of one poem is established (R122, Petition Concerning Amphimacri); three others are very likely his (those from which Michael borrowed); several of the remaining poems have positive evidence in favour of Henry's authorship in the form of verbal borrowings, etc.; and no poem in D provides evidence against Henry's authorship. As the authors of the previous article in this series urged, we must still be cautious in accepting Russell's sweeping ascription of the contents of A and D to Henry.¹⁰⁴ A firm statement of authorship must await a definitive study of Henry's style in those poems whose ascription is unassailable. The present article demonstrates in more detail than had hitherto been done the

¹⁰³ The anomalies we find are in A, and are related to Henry's early career. R21 (Rome and Innocent III) must have been written in 1215, perhaps at the papal curia; R45 and R46 are addressed to Engelbert, Archbishop of Cologne, who died in 1225. Unlike D, A contains some material which is known not to be Henry's: R13, 15, 31, 41a, 80, 86, 89a. Most of this material is fragmentary or added at the ends of gatherings or on leaves left blank.

¹⁰⁴ Townsend and Rigg, 'Medieval Latin Poetic Anthologies (V)', 390.

fact that the contents of D and some of the occasional verse in A together plausibly reflect the career of a poet who supported himself as a courtier and grammar master in England in the 1220s, in Italy in the late 1220s and early 1230s, briefly in Germany in the late 1230s or early 1240s, in France in the 1240s, and back in England in the 1240s and 1250s. The broad outlines of this career can be documented in poems ascribed to Henry of Avranches on sound evidence. Thus, there is good reason to believe that D is a collection of Henry's poems, copied somewhat haphazardly and perhaps at more than one remove from his own notebooks.

University of Toronto.

THE LAMBETH PALACE LIBRARY MANUSCRIPT ACCOUNT OF HENRY VI'S 1432 LONDON ENTRY*

Richard H. Osberg

ON 27 February 1432, King Henry VI entered the city of London, which had prepared against his coming a series of pageants to rival those arranged for his Paris coronation the previous year.¹ Information about the London pageants has been preserved in two sources. One, an English poem with Latin glosses by John Lydgate, is recorded in many chronicles, the earliest manuscript of which is London, British Library Cotton Julius B.ii, fols. 89v-98r.² The other, a Latin letter written by the London town clerk, John Carpenter, and preserved in the Corporation of London Records Office, Letter Book K, fols. 103v-104v, differs from Lydgate's poem in a number of important details.³ What has been thought to be

* I wish to acknowledge the support of Santa Clara University, whose generous grant of a Thomas Terry Research Award made the initial investigation for this essay possible.

¹ Ralph A. Griffiths suggests that the king's council may have played a role in commissioning the pageants (*The Reign of King Henry VI: The Exercise of Royal Authority, 1422-1461* [Kent, 1981], p. 221). Henry had left Paris on 27 December and crossed the Channel from Calais on 9 February. The Common Council found itself unable to finance the entertainment for the king, but on 21 January the Chamberlain agreed to loan the necessary monies from his own pocket (London, Corporation of London Records Office, Letter Book K, fol. 34v. See *Calendar of Letter-Books, Preserved among the Archives of the Corporation of the City of London*, ed. R. R. Sharpe, 11 vols. (London, 1899-1911).

² A number of copies of this poem survive; see C. Brown and R. H. Robbins, *The Index of Middle English Verse* (New York, 1943) and J. Cutler and R. H. Robbins, *Supplement to the Index of Middle English Verse* (Lexington, 1965), # 3799, for editions of Lydgate's poem and the prose narratives based on it. *A Manual of the Writings in Middle English, 1050-1500*, ed. A. E. Hartung, vol. 6 (New Haven, 1980), pp. 2117-18 offers a full bibliography of Lydgate's poem, and C. L. Kingsford, ed., *English Historical Literature in the Fifteenth Century* (Oxford, 1913), pp. 79-90, addresses the relationships among the various manuscripts of the London chronicles. Kingsford prints the account of the entry from British Library, Cotton Julius B.ii in *Chronicles of London* (Oxford, 1905), pp. 96-115.

³ Carpenter's letter is indifferently edited by H. T. Riley, *Munimenta Gildhallae Londoniensis; Liber Albus, Liber Custumarum, et Liber Horn*, 3 vols. (RS 12; London, 1862), 3.457-64. Another narrative, Gregory's *Chronicle*, seems to be based on Lydgate's poem; see *The Historical Collections of a Citizen of London in the Fifteenth Century*, ed. J. Gairdner (Camden Society N.S. 17; London, 1867), pp. 173-75. The differences between Lydgate's and Carpenter's accounts are detailed by H. N. MacCracken, 'King Henry's Triumphal Entry into London, Lydgate's Poem, and Carpenter's Letter', *Archiv für das Studium der neueren Sprachen und Literaturen* 126 (1911) 75-102.

an abbreviated copy of Carpenter's letter is preserved in Lambeth Palace Library, Lambeth 12, fol. 255r-v.⁴ Although differing in details, the three versions sketch broadly the same sequence of seven pageants: the giant who will defend the king in the first pageant on the bridge; Nature, Grace, and Fortune with their gifts in the second bridge pageant; Sapience and the seven founders of the liberal arts in Cornhill; in the fourth pageant, a child-king supported by Mercy, Truth, and Clemency; in the fifth, Mercy, Grace, and Pity drawing water from three fonts, also Enoch and Elisha in a 'paradise'; in the sixth pageant, at the Standard in Cheap, a castle of green jasper featuring royal and divine genealogical trees; and in the seventh, a throne of the Trinity. Unlike Carpenter's letter and Lydgate's poem, which detail the initial meeting of the king and citizens at Blackheath, the Recorder's speech, and the reception at St. Paul's following the pageantry, the Lambeth account opens with the description of the first pageant on London bridge and breaks off after the last pageant at St. Paul's gate.

Even considering its abbreviated character, the Lambeth text is not without significant lacunae; it omits, for instance, the song recorded in full in Carpenter and skips phrases here and there, occasionally whole lines of text. Some of its readings, like 'cum eorum speciosite' for 'omnium rerum speciositate', are obviously erroneous; others, like 'amenissimum locum & pulcherimum' for 'amenissimum & pulcherimum locum', seem to be scribal whimsy.⁵ Nevertheless, a close examination of the Lambeth account, Carpenter's letter, and Cotton Julius B.ii reveals differences that are not easily explained as scribal.

Not, in fact, a copy of Carpenter's letter, the Lambeth version provides an authority independent of both Lydgate's poem and Carpenter's letter, from which it differs in two significant ways: in a number of instances, Lambeth reproduces more accurately than Carpenter the Vulgate language that underlies both accounts, and in one case it affords an independent and better pageant 'scripture' (a biblical verse written out and attached to the pageant stage) than either Carpenter or the Latin marginalia of Cotton Julius B.ii.

Evidence for Lambeth's independent authority may be found first in the accuracy with which it cites the Vulgate. What has not been pointed out heretofore

⁴ J. O. Halliwell-Phillipps (*John Lydgate's Minor Poems* [Percy Society 2; London, 1840], p. 2) noted this account, but apparently he did not edit it as promised; see R. Withington, *English Pageantry: An Historical Outline*, 2 vols. (Cambridge, 1918; rpt. New York, 1980), 1.142, note 1.

⁵ A careful collation of the manuscripts reveals 168 differences between Carpenter's account and the Lambeth narrative. Although the many variations in abbreviations, spelling, and minor changes in word order have no probative value, in a number of its features Lambeth is more detailed than Carpenter. In three cases Carpenter omits to underline the 'scripture' associated with the pageant; Lambeth gives particular attention to the 'scriptures', providing the classical 'Nec tradat illum in manus inimicorum' for Carpenter's '& non tradat', (thus paralleling it with the preceding 'nec filius iniquitater'). Each 'scripture' in Lambeth is clearly identified as such by underlining, and pageant characters are formally identified — NATURE and GRACE, for instance.

is that Carpenter's Latin (and so too Lambeth's) depends largely on Vulgate constructions. Far from being an idiosyncratic eyewitness account, Carpenter's letter is a pastiche of phrases and verses from Psalmi, Isaias, Evangelium sec. Matthaeum, Apocalypsis, and so forth.⁶ A few lines will, I hope, demonstrate the point:

...domini Regis exultantes animis *plaudentes manibus & Iubilantes* [Omnes gentes, plaudite manibus; Iubilate Deo, (Ps 46:2)] *tripudijs Regi nostro psallebant sapienter* [...Psallite regi nostro, psallite; / Quoniam rex omnis terrae Deus, / Psallite sapienter, (Ps 46:7-8)] *nouum canticum siue carmen* [Et immisit in os meum canticum novum, / Carmen Deo nostro, (Ps 39:4)] in hec verba.

Such language, however, is not limited to descriptions of the pageants; Carpenter describes the twenty-four London aldermen as 'viginti quatuor seniores siue senatores', echoing Apocalypsis 19:4, and later he describes London itself as 'vbi tota Ciuitas super montem posita', reflecting the verse 'Non potest ciuitas abscondi supra montem posita' (Mt 5:14).

In a number of instances, Lambeth reproduces more accurately this biblical language than does Carpenter. The second column of the Lambeth text, for example, begins 'psallent regi nostro psallent', where Carpenter has only 'Regi nostro psallebant'. The repetition of 'psallent' in Lambeth might initially strike one as scribal error — easy enough to skip a few words at the top of a new column. Nonetheless, 'psallent regi nostro psallent' represents an echo of Psalm 46:7: 'Psallite Deo nostro, psallite; / Psallite regi nostro, psallite.' Similarly, describing the counselors a king should gather about him, Lydgate writes of 'folk that be trewe and well expert in lawe', a line that follows closely Carpenter's 'Reges & principes Iustos et scientificos viros In Iudiciis ferendis consilio.' Lambeth has by contrast 'Reges & principes bonos & Iustos et scientificos viros...', a phrase echoing the verse: 'vir bonus et iustus: hic non consenserat consilio' (Lc 23:50-51).

The most interesting of these differences, however, seems at first blush to be, like 'psallent', merely scribal. In the description of the Tabernacle of Sapientia, the third pageant in the sequence, Carpenter depicts the king riding 'vsque speciosum Tabernaculum Dominie sapiencie'. Lambeth has instead the king riding 'ad sponsii Tabernaculum Dominie sapiencie', where 'sponsii' looks like an attempt to make sense of a poor copy of 'speciosum'. However, this is not the case. Lambeth here

⁶ There is, of course, a long tradition in verse of the 'cento', a patchwork of passages from earlier poets. Proba's *Vergilianus* for example. See F. J. E. Raby, *A History of Christian-Latin Poetry from the Beginnings to the Close of the Middle Ages* (Oxford, 1927), p. 16. The style may be found as well in the Latin account of the miracles attributed to Henry VI from London, British Library Royal 13.C.viii, which Knox describes as showing 'the influence of Scriptural and classical erudition rather importunately, since these reminiscences are apt to form undigested lumps, for all the world like the "tags" from the Gradus schoolboys introduce into Latin verses' (*The Miracles of King Henry the Sixth*, eds. R. Knox and S. Leslie [Cambridge, 1923], p. 16).

anticipates another Vulgate verse, 'in vestitu deaurato circumdatam varietate', a description of Sapience occurring in Carpenter as well. This description comes from Psalm 44:10, 'filiae regum in honore tuo. / Astitit regina a dextris tuis / in vestitu deaurato, circumdata varietate', whose context makes the *sponsa* of Lambeth particularly apt: Wisdom, the daughter of a king, is conducted to the king with bridesmaids in her train. The psalm 'Carmen nuptiale regis Messiae', whence comes 'in vestitu deaurato circumdatam varietate', was generally understood to celebrate the marriage of the messianic King with Israel (prefiguring the Church); the liturgy, particularly in the Little Office of the Virgin, develops the allegory further by associating the bride with the Virgin. The relationship of Sapientia-Ecclesia and the *sponsa* was widely disseminated, and the iconography of this pageant may, in fact, be rooted in the 'Sedes sapientiae', or Throne of Solomon, whose imagery, as Gertrud Schiller observes, 'gradually, from the mid-twelfth century onwards, merged with that of the Virgin'.⁷ In addition to this description of Sapience in the third pageant, Psalm 44 provides as well the pageant 'scripture' for the final scene of the second pageant, 'intende, prospere procede, et regna' (Ps 44:5), suggesting that one of the themes linking the pageants in the sequence concerns the messianic kingship of Henry VI.⁸ The king (the *sponsus*), who receives the gifts of the Holy Ghost, 'septem deifice Virtutes in puellaribus effigiebus', in pageant two, is to wed Wisdom (the *sponsa*) in pageant three; iconographically, as Schiller remarks, because 'the gifts of the Holy Ghost were equated with the seven pillars of the House of Wisdom, they relate not only to Messianic prophecy but also to the idea of the House and the Throne of Solomon'.⁹

A second source of evidence for Lambeth's independent authority occurs in its attribution of one pageant 'scripture'. Where Carpenter's text reads 'rescripta dauidica / Honor Regis Iudium diligit necnon deus Iudicium tuum. . .', the Lambeth text reads 'rescripta propheta Honor regis iudicium diligit iusticia & iudicium correctio sedis eius' (underlined text in Lambeth corresponds everywhere else to the 'scriptures' reported in Carpenter and Cotton Julius B.ii). Lydgate's vernacular suggests that 'Mercy and Riht...kepyn euery kyng...His myhty Throne ffrom myschieff and fallyng', but the Latin verse in the margin of Cotton Julius B.ii reads at this point 'Iudicium & Iusticia', apparently as a continuation of the previous 'scripture': 'Et honor regis iudicium diligit. / Tu parasti directiones; / Iudicium et iustitiam in Iacob tu fecisti' (Ps 98:4). However, the Lambeth text points rather to Psalm 88:15, 'Iustitia et iudicium praeparatio sedis tuae; /

⁷ G. Schiller, *Iconography of Christian Art*, trans. J. Seligman, 2 vols. (London, 1971), 1.23.

⁸ I have discussed the implications of this imagery in 'The Jesse Tree in the 1432 London Entry of Henry VI: Messianic Kingship and the Rule of Justice', *The Journal of Medieval and Renaissance Studies* 16 (1986) 213-32.

⁹ Schiller, *Iconography of Christian Art* 1.23.

Misericordia et veritas praecedent faciem tuam', as the source of the pageant's iconography. The association in this verse of Justice, Mercy, Truth, and the king's throne argues that Psalm 88:15 is likely to have been one of the 'scriptures' for the pageant of 'Iustitiae thronus', whose pageant characters are Clemency, Mercy, and Truth. Lambeth, I believe, furnishes for the fourth pageant of the entry a 'scripture' missing altogether in Carpenter and Lydgate and mistakenly abbreviated and misquoted in the Latin marginalia of Cotton Julius B.ii.

The manuscript in which the Lambeth account occurs may provide a hint as to the political coloring of such differences. Lambeth 12, the third volume of a fine copy of Tynemouth's *Historia aurea* from the late fourteenth century, is almost certainly that manuscript recorded in the 1395 Catalogue of the library at Durham Cathedral.¹⁰ At first, the survival of a London pageant account in a Durham Cathedral manuscript raises more questions than it answers. Although the seat of a powerful Prince-Bishop (Bishop Langley played an important role in the King's council throughout the 1420's¹¹), Durham in the late Middle Ages was a remote fastness, 'half church to God, half castle 'gainst the Scot'. Even though Henry himself visited Durham in 1448, why and how an account of the 1432 pageant sequence found its way into a Benedictine manuscript from Durham Cathedral are questions with no very easy answers.

Two points of interest do emerge from a study of the manuscript, however. First, a number of scribes record their names. Particularly important is that of John Fishburn (the 'flyshborne' of folio 254r), who took orders c. 1394, served in several important capacities under Prior Wessington, and died probably in 1434.¹² His transcription of the 'Vision of St. Thomas and the ampulla', dated in the manuscript to 1407, is one among three short pieces added to the manuscript's final leaves before the pageant account. Additionally, on the blank verso of folio 247 are two extremely faint names, probably that of Richard Pooll, who took orders c. 1495, and that of John Wrake, chamberlain of Durham Cathedral Priory, 1509-1510.¹³

¹⁰ M. R. James, *A Descriptive Catalogue of the Manuscripts in the Library of Lambeth Palace: The Mediaeval Manuscripts* (Cambridge, 1932), p. 26 and N. R. Ker, *Medieval Libraries of Great Britain: A List of Surviving Books*, 2nd edition (London, 1964), p. 73.

¹¹ Langley was formally reappointed as chancellor of England on 16 November 1422 and was active in the council until at least 1426 (see Griffiths, *The Reign of King Henry VI*, pp. 33-38). Langley was apparently in residence at Bishop Auckland when Henry VI entered London (R. L. Storey, *Thomas Langley and the Bishopric of Durham 1406-1437* [London, 1961], p. 242).

¹² A. B. Emden (*A Biographical Register of the University of Oxford to A.D. 1500*, 3 vols. [Oxford, 1957-59], 2.737), provides the following information about John Fyshburne: professed c. 1395; Durham College scholar in 1402-1403; still in office 1410. He was appointed junior bursar of the college in 1407, senior bursar in 1410. He was cellarer of Durham in 1408 and chancellor of the Priory from 1416 until 1425. See also R. B. Dobson, *Durham Priory: 1400-1450* (Cambridge, 1973), p. 352, note 2.

¹³ I am indebted to Mr. A. J. Piper, reader in Paleography at Durham University, who kindly

Second, although a fine manuscript, clearly written and with good ornamentation, Lambeth 12 does not have a press mark (nor do Lambeth 10 and 11, the first and second volumes of the *Historia aurea*), indicating that it was never included in the collection of books placed in Prior Wessington's new library (built in 1414).¹⁴ In fact, no further references to the *Historia* may be found in any of the fifteenth-century book lists, nor any evidence that connects it to Durham Cathedral, although the names on fol. 247v make it clear that the manuscript remained in the possession of the Durham monks until the sixteenth century, probably right up until the dissolution.¹⁵

Through the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, Durham Cathedral Priory maintained a college at Oxford for the training of seven clerical and seven lay students.¹⁶ In 1407, the date of Fishburn's copy of the 'Vision of St. Thomas and

identified Fishburn as a Durham scribe and directed me to the names Richard Pool and John Wake on fol. 247v.

¹⁴ The 'Tertia pars Historiae aureae' is recorded in the list of books preserved in the cloisters during the librarianship of William de Appelby in 1395. Wessington's library press-marks may be seen in R. A. B. Mynors, *Durham Cathedral Manuscripts to the End of the Twelfth Century* (Oxford, 1939), plates 19, 21, and 34. See also S. L. Greenslade, 'The Contents of the Library of Durham Cathedral Priory', *Transactions of the Architectural and Archaeological Society of Durham and Northumberland* 11 (1965) 347-69.

¹⁵ John Wake, for instance, was probably a scholar at Durham College in 1498. He was chamberlain of Durham Cathedral Priory 1509-1510. See Emden, *A Biographical Register*, under Wrayk, John (3.2093).

¹⁶ The following monks seem to have been at Durham College in the early 1430's (assuming the Lambeth account was transcribed not too long after the event): Richard Barton, warden of Durham College, 1428-32. Richard Bell, (b. 1410), Durham College scholar, 1431-32 (vac. 1440). John Burnby, Durham College scholar, 1425 (vac. 1435), vice-chancellor of the University, 1447-49. William Clifton, Durham College scholar, admitted 1431-32. Robert Emyldon, junior, Durham College scholar, 1435-36 (examples of his hand can be seen in Cambridge, Fitzwilliam Museum 169 and Cambridge, Jesus College 70). Thomas Forster, Durham College scholar, 1423 until his death in 1436 or 1437. William Fysshburn, Durham College scholar, 1437-38, recalled in ill health 1440. Thomas Lewyn, Durham College scholar, 1425-26, probably until 1434. John Mody, Durham College scholar, 1422, warden, 1431-41. William Seton, Durham College scholar, 1431-32 (vac. 1449), warden of the college, 1463-65 (for an example of his hand, see Cambridge, Sidney Sussex College Library 56 [Δ. 3. 11]). Robert Westmorland, Durham College scholar 1427, still in 1429-30.

Of these, only Robert Bell and John Mody (proctor of the prior of Durham for parliament, 1434) appear to have had London connections; Robert Bell particularly seems to have enjoyed royal patronage. He was appointed prior of Holy Trinity, York, by the king in 1441 but was forced to resign in 1443 following opposition to the appointment.

Durham College secular scholars in the 1430's include a number of men who remained influential at Oxford: John Chamber, Durham College secular scholar, 8 Oct. 1434 (d. 1503). John Goldsmyth, Durham College secular scholar 1425-30, University College fellow 1430-38. John Goldyng, Durham College secular scholar, 1432-40, later prior of St. Frideswide (d. 1476). Robert Hartilpole, Durham College secular scholar, 1434, still in 1462-63; keeper of various chests, perhaps vicar of Aycliffe, Durham, 1461. He deposited Oxford, Brasenose College Library 4 (*Biblia Sacra*) in the Guildford chest as a caution for a loan, 1453, and redeemed it in 1464. John Killingworth (cf. Chillingworth in the *Dictionary of National Biography* [London, 1917; rpt. London, 1937-38]),

the ampulla', that monk was in fact junior bursar of Durham College, and Wrake was probably a scholar there in 1498. In short, it seems likely that the *Historia aurea* was sent down to Oxford sometime shortly after 1395 (going perhaps with Fishburn himself?) where it remained until the dissolution, whence it found its way into the Lambeth Palace collection. Although an Oxford provenance for the Lambeth account cannot be proved beyond doubt, it does make more colorable the thesis that differences among Lambeth, Carpenter, and Lydgate may proceed from political differences. Removed from the influence of London and London's partisanship for Gloucester, the Lambeth text may exhibit an authority and a political cast independent of London accounts.¹⁷

Writing under the mayor's correction, Lydgate may be supposed to reflect an official London interpretation of the pageants:

Durham College secular scholar (vac. 1432) at Merton College in 1432, fellow of Merton from 1436 until his death, junior proctor of the University, 1441-42. John Melott, Durham College secular scholar, nominated 1430. John Rumundby (Romondeby) Durham College secular scholar, nom. 1428 (vac. 1432). Richard Witton, Durham College secular scholar (vac. 1421), Fellow, University College 1421-26. Traveled to Rome with a letter of commendation addressed by the University to the Pope on his behalf.

There were as well a number of scholars with London or royal connections from the Durham diocese who may be supposed to have enjoyed relations with the College: Robert Burton, Merton College; indulgence to farm benefices while studying at the University or in the service of the king; member of the English delegation at the council of Basel, December 1432. John Maynesford, Durham City. Merton College 1425-26 (vac. 1440). Robert Rooke, Durham diocese. Balliol College 1427; vicar of St. Lawrence, Old Jewry, London, 1438; friend of William Ebchester, prior of Durham. William Sharpe, Durham diocese, University College; fellow in 1433-34; canon of St. George's Chapel, Windsor, 1454-55.

¹⁷ There were plenty of men at Oxford, men like John Carpenter, the king's chaplain (a close friend, perhaps a relative of John Carpenter, the London town clerk), Thomas Chaundler, warden of New College, and Thomas Gascoigne, twice chancellor of the University, who had London connections and more than a passing interest in the king's London reception. For Carpenter's relationship to the town clerk, see T. Brewer, *Memoir of the Life and Times of John Carpenter, Town Clerk of London in the Reign of Henry V. and Henry VI. and Founder of the City of London School* (London, 1856). Other Oxford men had particularly strong connections with various members of the royal family: John Stafford, a Beaufort supporter, was chancellor of the University from 1432 to 1438, and had accompanied Henry to France and attended the king at the French coronation. Gilbert Kymer, physician to Gloucester by 1433, resided in Durham College as chancellor of the University in 1449. Thomas Bourghier, chancellor of the University by March 1434, was postulated for the see of Ely at the suggestion of John Tiptoft in 1436. Thomas Bekynton, Winchester (1403) and New College (1406), was the king's secretary by 1437.

Beyond the walls of the university, Oxfordshire itself boasted men like John Golafre and Thomas Stonor, both pricked sheriffs in the 1420's, who were allied with Beaufort interests, as were others in the circle of Thomas Chaucer. Both Carpenter and Chaucer were in France in 1431; Carpenter probably saw the Paris pageants. For Chaucer, it was a second trip; he and Sir John Tiptoft had traveled to France in the autumn of 1424 to confer with Bedford on behalf of the English council. See M. Ruud, *Thomas Chaucer* (Research Publications of the University of Minnesota, Studies in Language and Literature 9; Minneapolis, 1926), p. 31.

O noble Meir be yt vnto youre plesaunce
 And to alle that duelle in this Citee
 On myn Rudenesse and on myn ygnoraunce
 Off grace and Mercy fforto haue pitee
 My Symple makynge fforto take at gree
 Considre this that is moste lowly wyse
 My wille were goode fforto do yow Servyse.¹⁸

Indeed, Lydgate seems to have relied on a source more similar to Carpenter than to Lambeth. For instance, where Carpenter, describing the titles associated with the Jesse tree, has '*Iustum titulum...dominum nostrum Regem linealiter deuolutum*', Lydgate follows: 'The degree be Iuste Successioun...Vnto the kyng ys now dessended down.' Lambeth here records, rather, '*nostrum Regem linealiter stabilitum*', where '*stabilitum*' expresses more potently than '*deuolutum*' ideas of affirmation and confirmation. Likewise, Carpenter describes the conduit in Cheap as '*Conductum aque spericum in dicto vico*', a phrase echoed in Lydgate's 'Conduyte made in Cercle wyse'; this phrase is replaced in Lambeth by '*vel ibidum iuxta aqua in plateis super libanum*', a mysterious reference to Mount Lebanon that seems to have biblical rather than topographical significance.¹⁹

Lydgate, however, seems even more reticent than Carpenter in his treatment of biblical imagery. For example, Carpenter reports that the pageant of Sapience was built on seven columns, '*super vii columnas quas exciderat*', a reference to Proverbs 9:1: '*Sapientia edificavit sibi domum, / Excidit columnas septem*.' This significant detail drops out of Lydgate's poem. Along these same lines, for the third 'scripture' of the second pageant, that of the Pauline gifts, Carpenter has '*Accipe coronam glorie . sceptrum . clementie / gladium Iustitie*'. Although a crown of glory is not among the 'whole armor of God' given in Epistola ad Ephesios 6:13-17, a similar list in Sapientia 5:17-19 begins '*Ideo accipient regnum decoris, / Et diadema speciei de manu Domini*'. Lambeth records no verb; the Latin gloss in Cotton Julius B.ii has the subjunctive '*Induat te Dominus corona glorie etc.*';

¹⁸ Cotton Julius B.ii, fol. 100v. C. L. Kingsford demonstrates the clear bias in favor of Gloucester that informs the 1432 Cotton Julius B.ii version of the London chronicles (*English Historical Literature*, p. 88). Describing the three fonts in the fourth pageant, Lydgate works in a compliment to the mayor, John Wells, 'O how thes welles who So take goode hede / With here likours moste holsome to ataine / Affore devysed notably in dede / fforto accorden with the meirys name / Which by Report off his worthy ffame / That day was busy in alle his gouernance / Vnto the kyng fforto done plesaunce', a compliment not offered in Carpenter or Lambeth.

¹⁹ The phrase '*plateis super Libanum*' does not occur in the Vulgate, although '*super Libanum*' does occur in Ps 71:16, and the source of the first 'scripture' in this pageant is Ps 71:2. The association of water with a place upon Lebanon may be from Canticum Canticorum 4:15, '*Fons hortorum, puteus aquarum viventium, / Quae fluunt impetu de Libano*', an echo perhaps of the *sponsa* of Lambeth's third pageant.

and Lydgate has 'God the endewe with a crowne off *glorie*.'²⁰ Carpenter's verb suggests that the pageant figures may actually have offered the crown to the king, as happened in the 1392 pageant sequence for Richard II.²¹ In the Latin gloss and in Lydgate's poem, there seems to be a deliberate distancing – the crown of glory, Lydgate hints, remains a consummation to be wished for.

Furthermore, although many of the Vulgate phrases shared by Carpenter and Lambeth are translated in Lydgate, they are phrased in such a way as to suggest that Lydgate deliberately played down the messianic theme. The reference to a *sponsa* in Lambeth disappears in Lydgate, and the description of Sapience as 'in vestitu deaurato circumdatam varietate' (in both Carpenter and Lambeth) is curiously deflected in Lydgate's translation:

A Tabernacle Surmountying off beaute
Ther was ordeyned be full fressh entayle
Richely arrayed with Ryall Apparayle.

The phrase was surely familiar, repeated as it is in the Little Office of the Virgin, and the iconography of Sapientia-Ecclesia as the *sponsa* is well established. The

²⁰ It should be noted that Lydgate's report of the 'nouum canticum' sung before the king by the virgins stationed on the tower of the second pageant is not indebted exclusively to Carpenter, who preserves twenty lines in carol form with burden:

Soueraign lord to your Cite
With alle reuerence Welcome ye be
Thanked be god of his goodnesse
þat you hath kept from hevynesse
And brought you ayen with gladenesse
London your Chambre for to se.

The carol preserved in Carpenter bears little resemblance to the rondel given in Lydgate's poem (generally two stanzas of seven and five lines rhymed abbaaba abbaa):

Sovereine lorde Welcome to youre Citee
Welcome oure Ioye and oure hertis plesaunce
Welcome oure gladnesse Welcome oure Suffisaunce
Welcome Welcome riht Welcome mote ye be.

The first and last lines of this version, with the padding of an extra 'welcome' and 'riht' to accommodate Lydgate's iambic pentameter, are similar to the Lambeth account of the song: 'hec verba vides. Souereyne lord to youre Cytee Welcom Welcom Welcom 3ee bee.' More confusing yet is a version of the Lydgate poem in Rome, The English College Library 1306 (printed by R. H. Robbins, 'A Middle English Diatribe against Philip of Burgundy', *Neophilologus* 39 [1955] 132-33) which preserves the first four lines of the rondel usually associated with Lydgate's poem, drops the following eight lines, and appends instead the full text of Carpenter's carol.

²¹ In 1377, the Goldsmith's pageant featured an angel who bowed down in Richard's presence, offering a golden crown. See T. Walsingham, *Historia anglicana*, ed. H. T. Riley, 2 vols. (RS 28; London, 1863), 1.331. This imagery was developed in the 1392 Reconciliation with the City of London so that two youths descended from the tower, giving the king and queen twin crowns. See 'Richard Maydiston *De concordia inter regem Ric. II et civitatem London'* in *Political Poems and Songs Relating to English History Composed during the Period from the Accession of Edw. III to That of Ric. III*, ed. T. Wright (London, 1859), pp. 282-300.

attribution of the phrase to the decoration of the Tabernacle rather than to the raiment of Wisdom can not be anything but deliberate on Lydgate's part. Along the same lines, Carpenter cites 'Dauidica' as the source for three pageants; Lydgate reduces these to one mention of David, 'Kyng dauyd wrote / the Sawter berith wyttnesse', in reference to the 'scripture' from Psalm 71:2. In contrast, Lambeth substitutes 'propheta' for 'dauidica' at every occasion, pointing again to its messianic reading of the entry.

On the basis of these differences between Lambeth and Lydgate, I think it can be argued that Lydgate distances the pageant from messianic allusion in a deliberate manner. The origins of this strategy may be hinted at in his account of the Jesse Tree pageant, which presented on one side the king's dynastic tree springing from St. Louis and St. Edward, and on the other side the royal genealogy of Christ, ascending from Jesse through King David to Mary:

And why the Iesse was sette on that partye
 This was the cause in Especcyall
 ffor next to Poulis I dar well specefye
 Is the partye moste Chieff and princypall
 Callyd off London the Chirche Cathederall
 Which ought off Resoun the devyse to excuse
 To alle thoo that wolde ageyn yt ffroune or muse.

Why, one is compelled to wonder, did some citizens disapprove of this pageant? And why did Lydgate, in this commemorative or souvenir poem, feel obliged to attempt a public defense of the device on grounds of its proximity to St. Paul's? Although the pageant intimates a supernatural sanction for Henry's claims to both the French and English crowns, the objections to it could not be to its promotion of the dual monarchy, whose symbols are everywhere present in the pageant sequence.²² Interestingly, the Jesse pageant is the only one in the sequence for which no account reports a 'scripture'. However, in an entry at Coventry in 1456, a 'lesse' was erected over the gate, from which vantage Ysay makes its significance explicit: 'like as mankynde was gladdid by the birght of Ihesus / So shall þis empyre ioy the birthe of your bodye', and Ieremy makes the iconographic connection to Queen Margaret and her son Edward: 'vn to the rote of lesse rote likkyn you well I may / the fragrant floure sprongon of you shall so encrece & sprede / that alle the world yn ich party shall cherisshe hym love & drede.'²³ Queen Margaret is a type of Mary; her son a type of Christ. As Lydgate's

²² J. W. McKenna ('Henry VI of England and the Dual Monarchy: Aspects of Royal Political Propaganda, 1422-1432', *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 28 [1965] 161) argues that in 'the attempt to imply supernatural authority for the dual inheritance of Henry VI', this 'double-sided billboard' represents the 'apotheosis of medieval dynastic advertisement'.

²³ *Coventry*, ed. R. W. Ingram (Records of Early English Drama; Toronto, 1981), pp. 29-30.

explanation of the 'Chirche Cathederal' suggests, objections must have been voiced to the explicit theocracy of paralleling Henry's and Christ's lineages – the equating of the eleven-year old Henry with Christ as the 'puer parvulus minabit eos', that is, as the 'fragrante floure', the *flos* of the Jesse Tree.²⁴

Messianic imagery was certainly not new to the English royal entry; those for Richard II in 1377 and 1392 employ messianic themes.²⁵ More important, however, is the role messianic imagery played in Bedford's propaganda on behalf of the dual monarchy.²⁶ As early as 1422, the French *salute* (named for the annunciation pictured on it) had been redesigned to associate Gabriel with the arms of England, and the Virgin with the arms of France.²⁷ Wolffe points out that the new English *ordo* for Henry's English coronation in 1429 was 'designed to emphasize the highest theocratic nature of Henry's kingship.'²⁸ Even the royal genealogy and Calot's poem (set up in churches in Lancastrian France), and Lydgate's translation of Calot (precursors of the Jesse Tree pageant) originate as justifications for the dual monarchy.²⁹ The Lambeth account plays up this messianic theme of Lancastrian propaganda, while Lydgate seems concerned at least to deflect criticism of its most salient pageant symbol.

Usually complicating the requisite adulation of the king's person and state in royal entries are the politics of the moment. Although the 1432 London pageant sequence celebrates the recently confirmed dual monarchy, significant setbacks to Lancastrian policy in France as well as troubles at home may find expression in individual pageants. Pageant four, for instance, features a child 'rayed like a kyng' accompanied by two judges and eight sergeants, a tableau of *Iusticia* that might well

²⁴ The iconography of the Jesse Tree was developed from Isaiah 11:1-7, a passage I believe lends thematic coherence to the entire pageant sequence. It would not be easy, however, to discover that coherence on the basis of Lydgate's poem alone.

²⁵ C. Smith, *Concordia facta inter regem Riccardum II et civitatem Londonie* (Diss. Princeton, 1972), pp. 53-54. Gordon Kipling points out that in this pageant, Richard is referred to repeatedly as the *sponsus*, London as *sponsa*. Kipling argues that the pageant sequence characterizes 'Richard's coming to his kingdom as a type of Christ's coming to the New Jerusalem...' ('Richard II's "Sumptuous Pageants" and the Idea of the Civic Triumph' in *Pageantry in the Shakespearean Theater*, ed. D. M. Bergeron [Athens, Georgia, 1985], pp. 89-91).

²⁶ P. S. Lewis ('War Propaganda and Historiography in Fifteenth-Century France and England', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 5th Ser., 15 [1965] 14-15) notes that French propaganda against the dual monarchy has survived in much greater volume than English propaganda in support of it, but there is more than Lewis acknowledges. See, for instance, Bekynnton's *Liber de jure regis Anglie ad regnum Francie*, a collection of documents in proof of Henry VI's rightful title to the French crown (London, British Library, Cotton Tiberius B.xii [see *Joannis Lelandi antiquarii De rebus britannicis collectanea*, ed. T. Hearne, 7 vols. (London, 1774), 4.155]). Bekynnton's collection suggests the kind of interest at Oxford that might have led to the preservation of the Lambeth account there.

²⁷ McKenna, 'Henry VI of England', 161.

²⁸ B. Wolffe, *Henry VI* (London, 1981), p. 50.

²⁹ B. J. H. Rowe, 'King Henry VI's Claim to France in Picture and Poem', *The Library*, 4th Ser., 13 (1932-33) 82-83.

be read as a topical allusion to the rising tide of lawlessness whose high water mark was the 1431 Lollard uprising.³⁰ Or again, Lydgate's emphasis on 'pees plente and plesaunce' may reflect the hope of London merchants that a settlement of the French conflict would also end the crown's reliance on poorly secured loans; between 1428 and 1436 London loaned £56,776 to the king, with little expectation that the tallies would be honored.³¹ In the citizens' response to some of the pageantry, especially the pageant of the Jesse Tree, may be discerned the factionalism that had periodically erupted in the king's council, particularly between Gloucester, with whom the Londoners were likely to side, and Bedford, the French regent.³² Here lies a possible explanation for Lydgate's minimizing the theocratic nature of the pageants. On 1 March 1432, Gloucester (later accused by Lord Cromwell of acting without the consent of council) made sweeping changes in the king's household, removing Lord Cromwell from the chamberlainship and Lord Tiptoft from the office of steward. Several clerks, among them William Hayton, John de la Bere and Sir John Styward were also swept from office. Both the king's confessor, Dr. John Walden, and the dean of the royal chapel, Richard Praty, were replaced as well.³³ Henry's signet, under which had been issued the letter of instruction commanding Gloucester to prepare for Henry's re-entry into England, was sealed up under Gloucester's signet and received into the custody of the exchequer. This flurry of activity suggests 'that the coronations and the French expedition had caused Duke Humphrey to fear a palace revolution centred on the possibility of Henry's first personal exercise of authority.'³⁴ These were men whose allegiance to Beaufort Gloucester rightly suspected, but it is interesting to speculate that the theocracy of the London pageants may have helped tip the scales for Gloucester against Henry's household. If the king's council had played a role in commissioning the pageants, John Wells, then mayor, wishing to dissociate himself

³⁰ Griffiths, *The Reign of King Henry vi*, p. 144.

³¹ Griffiths, *The Reign of King Henry vi*, p. 119.

³² As recently as 1425, factionalism on the king's council had nearly resulted in armed conflict between Gloucester and his uncle, Beaufort, whose troops were prevented from crossing London Bridge by an armed citizenry, and the Londoners' sympathies then and later lay with Gloucester against both Bedford and Beaufort.

³³ Griffiths, *The Reign of King Henry vi*, pp. 58-59. A number of these men had significant Oxford connections. Richard Praty is named one of eight masters of Oxford (*Munimenta academica, or Documents Illustrative of Academical Life and Studies at Oxford*, ed. H. Anstey, 2 vols. [RS 50; London, 1868], 1.256), and was a fellow of Oriel College, 1412-24 (Emden). John de la Bere, Almoner to Henry vi in 1431, was rector of St. Martin's, Oxford, 1424 (vac. November 1433), and was granted a letter of protection on going overseas in the retinue of Sir John Styward for the king's French coronation. William Hayton was charged with rent of rooms in Queen's College in 1421 and again in 1428-29. Ralph Cromwell's friend, William Worcester, would have been a student at Great Hart Hall, Oxford, at about this time. John Tiptoft's son (b. 1427) was educated at Balliol College, although well after the time of the pageants (1440-43).

³⁴ Wolffe, *Henry vi*, p. 67.

from any blush of complicity, may have authorized Lydgate to write his poem with its apologia for the Jesse pageant as a careful man's precaution against guilt by association.

Particularly significant in this connection is the 'scripture' for the pageant of 'Iustitiae thronus' furnished by the Lambeth account and omitted in Carpenter and Lydgate. In the Lambeth account, the king's justice, although tempered by Mercy and Clemency, remains nonetheless theocratic and absolute, as the context of its 'scripture' from Psalm 88:15 makes clear: 'Beatus populus qui scit iubilationem. / Domine, in lumine vultus tui ambulabunt' (Ps 88:16). Lydgate, however, provides an English translation for a 'scripture' not to be found in the Latin glosses of Cotton Julius B.ii, Carpenter, or Lambeth: 'honour off kyng which I Shall expresse / With this Scripture in euery manys siht / Off Comyn Custum lovith equitye and Riht', a seeming limitation of the king's prerogative whose reference to 'common custom' stresses civil rather than theocratic law.

Lambeth's likely Oxford provenance may suggest a greater sympathy with Bedford's Lancastrian propaganda than either Carpenter's or Lydgate's London provenance. The dissimilarities among these three accounts, then, may reflect political differences regarding the messianic theme and its theocratic implications. The Lambeth version appears to betray the propagandizing hand of Bedford's Lancastrian theocracy in its implicit parallels between the child-king Henry and the Christ-like prince, 'the little child who will lead them' of the messianic prophecies, and in its explicit description of Wisdom as the *sponsa*. Desiring to write for the Mayor a commemorative or souvenir poem, Lydgate followed an account similar to Carpenter's letter. In doing so, he made as faint as possible the echoes of the *adventus* of the messianic king. The messianic theme, of course, is deeply rooted in the English royal entry, but if it is true that accounts of pageantry exert in the long run far more influence on the political life and thought of a nation than do the pageants themselves, then it is Lydgate's poem, and not Carpenter's letter or the Lambeth account, which established the prevailing 'reading' of the 1432 London pageants and cast the mold for late fifteenth- and early sixteenth-century royal entries.³⁵

Santa Clara University.

³⁵ Lydgate's poem, for instance, served as the source for the coronation entry of Edward vi, although the Jesse, which had been portrayed in 'tableau vivant' at the Standard in Cheap is replaced in the later entry by England, who exhorts Edward to follow in his 'fathers steppes' (see Leland, *Collectanea* 4.310-33); in the *New Chronicle of England and France* (ed. H. Ellis [London, 1811], pp. 603-607), Robert Fabyan rewrites portions of Lydgate's poem as speeches for the pageant characters, but of the Jesse Tree notes only 'the sprynge of Jesse, wherein was shewyd the genology of our blessed Lady', so directing attention away from the parallel between the king and Christ.

A FRAGMENT OF A LITURGICAL ROLL AT MONTECASSINO (COMPACTIONES XVI)*

Richard F. Gyug

THE *compactiones* of the Archivio della Badia of Montecassino are folders containing flyleaves, binding strips, and dismembered fragments of other sorts from the codices of the Archive and elsewhere. Although a catalogue of the *compactiones* is promised and the folders have often been searched for new material, the fondo remains without a published guide to its contents.¹ In their present state, therefore, the hundreds of fragments of the *compactiones* represent the last large collection of unidentified material in the Beneventan script. Thus preserved in *Compactiones XVI* has been a hitherto unremarked fragment of a liturgical roll in Beneventan script containing the first of the *Orationes sollemnes* for Good Friday. Its interest lies both in its format and in its content: no other roll for Good Friday is reported to have been preserved, nor has anyone suggested the existence of such a roll, despite numerous witnesses in roll-form to the liturgy of Holy Saturday. As to its content, the formula for the diaconal monition to kneel, say the *Pater noster*, and rise ('*Flectamus genua. Pater noster. Erigamus nos.*') between the formal invitation to pray and the prayer itself represents the most

* The discovery of the fragment in June 1989 was made possible through the permission of Don Faustino Avagliano, archivist-librarian of Montecassino, and a research grant provided by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada for the study of 'monumenta liturgica beneventana'.

¹ The catalogue for the numbered codices of the Archivio of Montecassino is Mauro Inguanez, *Codicum casinensium manuscriptorum catalogus*, 3 vols. (Montecassino, 1915-41); and for liturgical books, Faustino Avagliano, 'I codici liturgici dell'Archivio di Montecassino', *Benedictina* 17 (1970) 300-25; Don Avagliano is preparing a catalogue of the *compactiones* (see E. A. Loew, *The Beneventan Script. A History of the South Italian Minuscule*, 2nd edition prepared and enlarged by Virginia Brown, 2 vols. [Rome, 1980], 2.92 note 1). Studies based on the material of the *compactiones* include Alban Dold, 'Umfangreiche Reste zweier Plenarmissalien des 11. und 12. Jh. aus Monte Cassino', *Ephemerides liturgicae* 53 (1939) 111-67 (*Compactiones* vi and vii), Klaus Gamber, 'Fragmenta Liturgica V: 29. Fragmente eines beneventanischen Missale in Montecassino', *Sacris erudiri* 21 (1972-73) 241-47 (*Compactiones* vii), and John Boe, 'Old Beneventan Chant at Montecassino: Gloriosus Confessor Domini Benedictus', *Acta musicologica* 55 (1983) 69-73 (*Compactiones* xxii).

ancient structure of the rite, preserved elsewhere only among the earliest sources of the liturgy and a handful of later Beneventan manuscripts.²

Concerning the format, rolls in contrast to codices occupy a small but important niche among the liturgical books of western Europe. Rolls were more prominent in eastern churches,³ but the Latin churches do not lack instances of liturgical and paraliturgical texts presented on rolls.⁴ Conciliar decisions were recorded on rolls, of which at least one copy has survived and others are portrayed in illustrations.⁵ Paraliturgical drama and music are sometimes written on rolls, an appropriate format for the material required by individual participants in a larger dramatic

² René-Jean Hesbert ('L'"Antiphonale missarum" de l'ancien rit bénéventain', *Ephemerides liturgicae* 60 [1946] 103-141 at pp. 133-35) discusses the Orationes sollemnes of the Beneventan liturgy and their distinctive monitions.

³ See Guglielmo Cavallo, *Rotoli di Exultet dell'Italia meridionale. Exultet 1, 2, Benedizionale dell'Archivio della cattedrale di Bari. Exultet 1, 2, 3 dell'Archivio capitolare di Troia* (Bari, 1973), pp. 32-35, and 'La genesi dei rotoli liturgici beneventani alla luce del fenomeno storico-librario in Occidente ed Oriente' in *Miscellanea in memoria di Giorgio Cencetti*, ed. Alessandro Pratesi (Turin, 1973), pp. 213-29 at pp. 221-25, for liturgical rolls in the Greek church, including several mass-texts written in southern Italy, e.g., Rome, Biblioteca Vallicelliana G 70 (gr. 112) (liturgy of St. John Chrysostom, s. xii); Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana (hereafter BAV) Vat. gr. 1554, fol. 1r (liturgy of St. John Chrysostom, s. xii), BAV Borg. graec. 27 (liturgy of St. John Chrysostom [1085-1111]); and Bari, Archivio del Duomo, Exultet 3 (palimpsest, s. xi; upper script is a Beneventan Exultet, s. xii). A more problematic document is the 'rotula officii sancti baptiste** grece compositi' cited in an eleventh-century catalogue of the library of Gorze (Germain Morin, 'Le catalogue des manuscrits de l'abbaye de Gorze au XI^e siècle', *Revue bénédictine* 22 [1905] 1-14 at p. 10).

⁴ The following references to rolls in the western medieval church are based on the materials presented by Christopher Walter, *L'iconographie des conciles dans la tradition byzantine* (Archives de l'Orient chrétien 13; Paris, 1970), pp. 53-61; John Brückmann, 'Latin Manuscript Pontificals and Benedictionals in England and Wales', *Traditio* 29 (1973) 391-458; Niels Krogh Rasmussen, 'Unité et diversité des Pontificaux latins au VIII^e, IX^e et X^e siècles' in *Liturgie de l'église particulière et liturgie de l'église universelle. Conférences Saint-Serge, XXII^e semaine d'études liturgiques* (Paris, 30 juin-3 juillet 1975) (Rome, 1976), 393-410 at pp. 399-401; Michel Huglo, 'Codicologie et musicologie' in *Miscellanea codicologica F. Masai dicata MCMLXXIX*, eds. Pierre Cockshaw, Monique-Cécile Garand, and Pierre Jodogne, 2 vols. (Les publications de Scriptorium 8; Ghent, 1979), 1.71-82 at pp. 72-76; Bernhard Bischoff, *Paläographie des römischen Altertums und des abendländischen Mittelalters*, 2nd edition (Berlin, 1986), pp. 52-54; and Roger E. Reynolds, 'Roll, Book, and Candle: Rolls in Medieval Liturgy' (a paper delivered in March 1987 at the University of Notre Dame).

⁵ A conciliar roll is preserved in Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek C1m 29555/2 (rotulus, c. 813; cf. Hubert Mordek, 'Karolingische Kapitularien' in *Überlieferung und Geltung normativer Texte des frühen und hohen Mittelalters*, ed. Hubert Mordek [Quellen und Forschungen zum Recht im Mittelalter 4; Sigmaringen, 1986], pp. 25-50, at p. 33 and plate 2). Medieval illustrations include the conciliar scene from the Utrecht Psalter where scribes are noting decisions on scrolls (Utrecht, Universiteitsbibliotheek 32 [Eccl. 484], fol. 90v; Walter, *L'iconographie*, pp. 53-55); and the 'codices' of decisions from the Council of Toledo which are portrayed as rolls in the Codex Amelianus and Codex Vigilanus Albeldensis (El Escorial, Real Biblioteca de San Lorenzo I D 1, and I D 2; Walter, *L'iconographie*, pp. 55-61); see also Roger E. Reynolds, 'Rites and Signs of Conciliar Decisions in the Early Middle Ages' in *Segni e riti nella chiesa altomedievale occidentale*. (Settimane di studio del Centro italiano di studi sull'alto medioevo 33; Spoleto, 1987), pp. 207-249.

setting.⁶ The form was often used for monastic necrologies and less frequently for *vitae*.⁷

Several liturgical functions appear in roll-form, beginning with the famous Rotulus of Ravenna containing a series of prayers probably intended for the Vigil of Christmas.⁸ Illustrations of the ordinations of exorcists indicate that the exorcisms to be read by the exorcist were preserved in rolls;⁹ a few *rotuli* containing benedictions performed by bishops have also survived.¹⁰ The canon of the Mass sent by Pope Zacharius in 740-50 to Boniface in Germany is described as a 'rotulus'.¹¹ The prayers of ordinations were to be found on rolls according to Hincmar in his letter to Adventius of Metz.¹² In 884 Notker Balbulus describes in the preface to his collection of sequences their composition on rolls before they

⁶ Cf. Bischoff, *Paläographie*, p. 53, including Frankfurt am Main, Stadt- und Universitätsbibliothek Barth. 178 ('Frankfurter Dirigierrolle', s. xiv in.); and Sulmona, Archivio Capitolare di S. Panfilo, Fasc. 47 n. 9 (Easter Play, s. xv). Huglo ('Codicologie', 73, 75) cites later medieval rolls used by composers, e.g., Brussels, Bibliothèque Royale Albert I^{er}, 19906 (motets); see also Richard H. Rouse, 'Roll and Codex: The Transmission of the Works of Reinmar von Zweter' in *Paläographie 1981. (Colloquium du Comité International de Paléographie, München, 15-18 September 1981)*, ed. Gabriel Silagi (Münchener Beiträge zur Mediävistik und Renaissance-Forschungen 32; Munich, 1982), pp. 107-123.

⁷ On necrologies and lists of the dead in roll-form, see Nicolas Huyghebaert, *Les documents nécrologiques* (Typologie des sources du moyen âge occidental 4; Turnhout, 1972), pp. 26-32. The Life of St. Guthlac survives in London, British Library Harley Roll Y 6 (c. 1200; Jane Roberts, 'An Inventory of Early Guthlac Materials', *Mediaeval Studies* 32 [1970] 193-233 at p. 208).

⁸ Milan, Biblioteca Ambrosiana S.P. cassaf. 1 (collects, s. vii/viii, Ravenna; Klaus Gamber, *Codices liturgici latini antiquiores*, 2nd edition [Spicilegii friburgensis subsidia 1 in 2 parts; Freiburg/Switzerland, 1980], no. 660, and *Suppl. Ergänzungs- und Registerband* [Spicilegii friburgensis subsidia 1a; Freiburg/Switzerland, 1988], no. 660); Ambrosiana S.P. cassaf. 1 is edited by Suitbert Benz, *Der Rotulus von Ravenna nach seiner Herkunft und seiner Bedeutung für die Liturgiegeschichte kritisch untersucht* [Liturgiewissenschaftliche Quellen und Forschungen 45; Münster, 1967]).

⁹ Cf. Rome, Biblioteca Casanatense 724 (i) (ordinations, s. x ex.; Loew, *The Beneventan Script* 2.122); facs. Myrtila Avery, *The Exultet Rolls of Southern Italy* (Princeton, 1936), plate 106. In the Roman-German Pontifical, *Ordo* 15: 17 (eds. Cyrille Vogel and Reinhard Elze, *Le Pontifical romano-germanique*, 3 vols. [Studi e testi 226, 227, 269; Vatican City, 1963-72], 1.17) describes the exorcist's receipt of a 'libellus' during his ordination.

¹⁰ E.g., Cambridge, Emmanuel College Library III.2.24 (pontifical, s. xiv in.; Brückmann, 'Latin Manuscript Pontificals', 408); London, British Library Cotton Charter Roll XIII.4 (pontifical, s. xiii; Brückmann, 'Latin Manuscript Pontificals', 438); and Oxford, Keble College Roll 1 (benedictional, s. xv in.; Brückmann, 'Latin Manuscript Pontificals', 456; Malcolm B. Parkes, *The Medieval Manuscripts of Keble College Oxford* [London, 1979], p. 332). For a pontifical-roll containing ordinations, see Ferdinando Dell'Oro, 'Frammento di Rotolo Pontificale del secolo XI' in *Traditio et Progressio. Studi liturgici in onore del Prof. Adrien Nocent, O.S.B.*, ed. Giustino Faredi (Analecta liturgica 12, Studia Anselmiana 95; Rome, 1988), pp. 177-204, with an edition of Asti, Biblioteca Capitolare XIII (rotulus, s. xi).

¹¹ *MGH Epistolae Merowingici et Karolini aevi*, ed. Ernst Dümmler (Berlin, 1892), 1.372; cf. Rasmussen, 'Unité et diversité', 399.

¹² PL 126.187; cf. Rasmussen, 'Unité et diversité', 400.

were codified.¹³ The *Laudes* of Lorsch are testimony to the form used for Christmas and crown wearings,¹⁴ and coronation ordines are also found on rolls.¹⁵ In the tenth-century Pontifical of Egbert a roll is cited for the names of penitents to be read by the archdeacon on Holy Thursday.¹⁶ The litanies of Milan were sung from *rotuli* according to the twelfth-century description by Beroldus.¹⁷ Rolls, therefore, appear in many ecclesiastical and liturgical functions, especially those with short texts, texts performed by an individual among several coordinated celebrants, and musical texts. It may also be noted that the ceremonies are often moments of the highest significance, public spectacle, and communal importance.

Congruent with such requirements is the most renowned use of the liturgical rotulus, and certainly the most well-attested form: the Exultet rolls of southern Italy.¹⁸ Almost exclusively written in the Beneventan script, originating in the heart of the Beneventan zone – Monte Cassino, Campania, and Puglia – and frequently lavish in presentation, illustration, and ornament, these rolls contain the text and music of the Exultet sung by the deacon during the Holy Saturday vigil at the blessing of the Paschal candle. Other liturgical rolls have also been preserved from the region, specifically two rolls of the *Benedictio fontis* to be used on Holy

¹³ *Notkeri Liber ymnorum*, Prooemium; ed. Wolfram von den Steinen, *Notker der Dichter und seine geistige Welt*, 2 vols. (Bern, 1948), 2.10; cf. Huglo, 'Codicologie', 72-73.

¹⁴ Frankfurt-am-Main, Stadt- und Universitätsbibliothek Appendix III (litanies, s. ix; *CLLA* no. 777 and *Suppl.*; Bischoff, *Paläographie*, p. 52, note 103).

¹⁵ E.g., London, Public Record Office Coronation Roll 1 (C. 57-1) (s. xiv; Brückmann, 'Latin Manuscript Pontificals', 443).

¹⁶ Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale lat. 10575 (pontifical, s. x; *CLLA* no. 1570), fol. 181v; ed. H. M. J. Banting, *Two Anglo-Saxon Pontificals* (Henry Bradshaw Society Publications 104; London, 1989), p. 148; cf. Rasmussen, 'Unité et diversité', 400.

¹⁷ *Beroldus sive Ecclesiae ambrosianae mediolanensis Kalendarium et ordines, saec. XII*, ed. Marco Magistretti (Milan, 1894), pp. 55 line 29, 57 lines 22-27, 110 lines 3-4; cf. also his *Manuale Ambrosianum* (Milan, 1905), 1.7-8; Rasmussen, 'Unité et diversité', 400.

¹⁸ On the Exultet rolls of southern Italy, see *CLLA* nos. 485-499 and *Suppl.* nos 485-499, and the literature cited on p. 255. Among the many works treating the Exultets, see especially Émile Bertaux, *L'art dans l'Italie méridionale* (Paris, 1904; rpt. Rome, 1968), and the additions by Rosalba Zuccarro in *Aggiornamento dell'opera di Émile Bertaux*, ed. Adriano Prandi, 4 vols. (Rome, 1978), 1.423-66; René-Jean Hesbert, 'La tradition bénéventaine dans la tradition manuscrite' in *Le Codex 10673 de la Bibliothèque Vaticane. Fonds latin (XI^e siècle). Graduel bénéventain* (Paléographie musicale 14; Solesmes, 1931), pp. 375-423; Avery, *Exultet Rolls*; Gerhart B. Ladner, 'The "Portraits" of Emperors in Southern Italian Exultet Rolls and the Liturgical Commemoration of the Emperor', *Speculum* 17 (1942) 181-200; Cavallo, *Rotoli* and 'La genesi dei rotoli liturgici', 213-29; M. L. Wulfbain, 'The Liturgical Rolls of South Italy and their possible Origin' in *Miniatures, Scripts, Collections: Essays presented to G. I. Liefstinck/4* (Amsterdam, 1976), pp. 9-15; Mario Rotili, 'L'"Exultet" della cattedrale di Capua e la miniatura "beneventana"' in *Il contributo dell'archidiocesi di Capua alla vita religiosa e cultura del Meridione* (Atti del Convegno nazionale di studi storici promosso dalla Società di storia patria di Terra di Lavoro, 26-31 ottobre 1966) (Rome, 1967), pp. 197-210; Penelope C. Mayo, 'Vasa sacra: Apostolic Authority and Episcopal Prestige in the Eleventh-Century Bari Benedictional', *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 41 (1987) 375-87; and the bibliographies for individual rolls cited in Loew, *The Beneventan Script*.

Saturday,¹⁹ an *Ordo officiorum* containing the consecrations of the minor and major orders,²⁰ and the hitherto-unknown fragment of a Good Friday roll described here.

While discussions of the rolls of southern Italy have considered them as accommodations to eastern practice or remnants of earlier customs,²¹ the solemnity and importance of the ceremonies thus written may be crucial to understanding the form. In Greek rolls, the minister is the defining force, that is, the roll usually contains the text to be sung by the celebrant whereas the other participants used other books (see note 3 above). Similarly, Exultet rolls for the deacon were required as separate practical books, just as books of epistles or choir books are specific to particular participants. Such motives certainly define liturgical genres in some instances, and probably play a large part in the production of southern Italian rolls. But the coincidence of the form with some of the most important and conspicuous ceremonies of the liturgy — the lighting of the Exultet candle, baptism, and ordination — suggests that solemnity was also a critical element in the choice to use the roll-form. In this regard, the present fragment of a roll containing some of the prayers recited by the principal celebrant (priest or bishop) on Good Friday after the Gospel emphasises the importance of solemnity in the definition of the form since it expands the number of ceremonies thus presented to include three of the central rituals of Holy Week (the Exultet, baptism, and now Good Friday).

The contents of the fragmentary roll in *Compactiones* xvi are no less remarkable than its format. Hesbert has described the distinctive practice of the *Orationes sollemnes* among some Beneventan manuscripts which have the diaconal monition 'Erigamus nos' instead of the synonomous 'Levate' of the Roman liturgy.²² Given

¹⁹ Rome, Biblioteca Casanatense 724 (ii) (baptismal roll, s. x/xi; Loew, *The Beneventan Script* 2.122-23); Bari, Archivio del Duomo S.N. (baptismal roll, ante a. 1067, Bari; Loew, *The Beneventan Script* 2.15; Mayo, 'Vasa sacra', 375-87).

²⁰ Rome, Biblioteca Casanatense 724 (i) (pontifical, s. x ex., Benevento; Loew, *The Beneventan Script* 2.122).

²¹ Cavallo, *Rotoli*, pp. 32-35, and 'La genesi dei rotoli liturgici', 223-29, argues for the origin of the form in imitation of contemporary Greek practice; see also Ladner, 'Portraits' of Emperors', 181-200. On the other hand, Hans Belting (*Studien zur beneventanischen Malerei* [Wiesbaden, 1968], pp. 182-83) considers the roll-form to be a survival of the earlier western tradition represented by the Rotulus of Ravenna (see note 8 above).

²² Hesbert, 'Antiphonale missarum', 133-35; also Hesbert, *Pal. mus.* 14.296-97, 299-300, for tables comparing Good Friday ceremonies from several manuscripts. The older regional practice ('Erigamus nos') is cited from Benevento, Biblioteca Capitolare 33 (missal, s. x/xi, ed. Jacques Hourlier and Jacques Froger, *Le manuscrit VI-33 Archivio arcivescovile Benevento. Missel de Bénévent (début du XI^e siècle)* [Paléographie musicale 20; Bern, 1983]); Benevento, Biblioteca Capitolare 38 (gradual, s. xi; Loew, *The Beneventan Script* 2.22); Benevento, Biblioteca Capitolare 39 (gradual, s. xi; Loew, *The Beneventan Script* 2.22); and Vatican City, BAV Vat. lat. 10673 (gradual, s. xi, ed. *Pal. mus.* 14). Later Roman practice ('Levate') is cited from Vatican City, BAV Vat. lat. 6082 (missal, s. xii; Loew, *The Beneventan Script* 2.152); Vatican City, BAV Barb. lat. 603 (missal, s.

that the manuscripts with the form 'Erigamus nos' are otherwise the most conservative in preserving the Old Beneventan chant, it is likely that the monition is part of a regional and ancient form of the *Orationes sollemnes*.²³

The indication in *Compactiones* xvi to say the *Pater noster* between the commands to kneel and rise is also an unusual feature, although it has been partially erased, perhaps at a later date. The medieval Roman forms of the *Orationes sollemnes* presented modified versions of the universal prayer of the early church which followed the Gospel.²⁴ Before the development of the medieval corpus, these prayers began with an extended invitation (e.g., 'Oremus dilectissimi nobis in primis pro ecclesia sancta' etc.), then a monition to kneel for reflection before rising for the universal prayer itself. Beginning with the prohibitions against kneeling during festive seasons issued by the Council of Nicea in 325, the occasions for such practice diminished: this early form of prayer came to be restricted to a few feasts, including the *Orationes sollemnes* of Good Friday. In the Vatican Gelasian, the intention of kneeling remains as a short pause:

*postolans sacerdos pro se orare et dicit: Oremus. Et adnuntiat diaconus: Flectamus genua. Et post paulolum dicit: Leuate. Et dat Orationem.*²⁵

The memory of earlier practice is preserved more explicitly in a handful of sources, such as the following instance from a Frankish manuscript of the *Hadrianum*:

*Et dicit diaconus flectamus genua, postquam orauerint dicit leuate, postea dicit sacerdos orationem.*²⁶

xii/xiii; Loew, *The Beneventan Script* 2.162); and Vatican City, BAV Ottob. lat. 576 (missal, s. xii ex.; Loew, *The Beneventan Script* 2.166).

²³ For Old Beneventan chant, see Thomas Forrest Kelly, *The Beneventan Chant* (Cambridge, 1989).

²⁴ Cf. Paul De Clerck, *La 'Prière universelle' dans les liturgies latines anciennes, Témoignages patristiques et textes liturgiques* (Liturgiewissenschaftliche Quellen und Forschungen 62; Münster, 1977). For the Roman liturgy, see Mario Righetti, *Manuale di storia liturgica*, 2nd edition, 4 vols. (Milan, 1950-59), 1.312-14; Josef Andreas Jungmann, *Missarum Sollemnia. Eine genetische Erklärung der römischen Messe*, 4th revised edition, 2 vols. (Vienna, 1958), 1.471-75, 614-28; Robert Cabié, *L'Eucharistie* (L'Église en prière 2; Tournai, 1983), p. 89; and Martin Klöckener, *Die Liturgie der Diözesansynode* (Liturgiewissenschaftliche Quellen und Forschungen 68; Münster, 1986), pp. 160-62.

²⁵ Vatican City, BAV Reg. lat. 316 + Paris, BN lat. 7193, fols. 41-56 (sacramentary, s. viii med.; *CLLA* no. 610 and *Suppl.*); eds. Leo Cunibert Mohlberg, Leo Eizenhöfer, and Petrus Siffrin, *Liber sacramentorum romanae ecclesiae ordinis anni circuli*, (Rerum ecclesiasticarum documenta, Series maior, Fontes 4; Rome, 1960), no. 395.

²⁶ Vatican City, BAV Ottob. lat. 313 (sacramentary of Paris, s. ix 3/4; *CLLA* no. 740); ed. Jean Deshusses, *Le sacramentaire grégorien. Ses principales formes d'après les plus anciens manuscrits*, vol. 1.1: *Hadrianum ex authentico* (Cambrai 164) (Spicilegium friburgense 16; Freiburg/Switz., 1979), no. 339 (in apparatu). See also *Ordo romanus* 29: 33 (ed. Michel Andrieu, *Les ordines romani du haut moyen âge*, 5 vols. [Spicilegia sacra lovaniensia 11, 23, 24, 28, 29; Louvain, 1931-61], 3.442): 'dicat sacerdos: Oremus; et diaconus: Flectamus genua; et orent diutissime, usquedum dicat diaconus: Levate.'

For the most part, medieval sources reduce the command to a quick genuflection: 'Flectamus genua-Levate'. In some later witnesses, the period of kneeling is lengthened through delay of the command to rise until the closing of the celebrant's prayer, that is, the congregation remains kneeling until commanded to rise at 'per eundem'.²⁷

The diverse formulas of the medieval church are paralleled among Beneventan sources. Where 'Levate' was the preferred text, such as at Montecassino or in later manuscripts from Benevento, the norm appears to have been the quick genuflection of the Roman liturgy,²⁸ although the Beneventan manuscripts of the Roman-German Pontifical delay the command to rise until the closing of the celebrant's prayer at 'per eundem'.²⁹ Among the manuscripts with the regional 'Erigamus' for 'Levate', the text of Benevento 33 resembles the intercalated Hadrianum:

Inde induat se sacerdos sacris uestibus. dicat orationem. Oremus dilectissimi nobis pro ecclesia sancta ... Oremus. Et dicat diaconus. Flectamus genua. Et postquam orauerint. dicat diaconus. Erigamus nos. Deinde dicat sacerdos. Omnipotens sempiterne deus (Benevento 33, fol. 71v; see note 22 above).

The practice described in Benevento 38 follows exactly that recorded in *Compactiones* xvi before the erasure of its Pater noster:

Tunc sacerdos seu episcopus induatur sacris uestibus et dicatur oratio quomodo in sacramentario continetur. et dicatur a diacono. Flectamus genua. Et orent Pater noster. et postquam orauerint pater noster. R. alius diaconus. Erigamus nos (Benevento 38, fol. 43r).³⁰

Although the Pater noster in these sources is indicative of a regional tradition of copying, it is probably not a remnant of ancient practice since the sources are not unanimous. While the unspecified text of the intercalated Hadrianum and Benevento 33 may have been the paradigmatic prayer itself, that is, the Pater noster, it is more plausible to consider the Pater noster of the later manuscripts as a typical instance of the general medieval development towards rubrical precision.³¹

²⁷ E.g., *Ordo romanus* 50.27: 15 (ed. Andrieu, *Ordines romani* 5.253; = *Ordo* 99: 311; Vogel-Elze, *Le Pontifical* 2.88).

²⁸ Montecassino: Vat. lat. 6082 (Hesbert, *Pal. mus.* 14.301); Benevento: London, BL Egerton 3511 (olim Benevento, Biblioteca Capitolare 29; missal, s. xii; Loew, *The Beneventan Script* 2.53), fol. 144r.

²⁹ E.g., Montecassino, Archivio della Badia 451 (pontifical, s. xi^{3/4}; Loew, *The Beneventan Script* 2.87), ed. Vogel-Elze, *Le Pontifical* 2.88); and Macerata, Biblioteca Comunale 'Mozzi-Borgetti' 378 (pontifical, s. xii ex.), ed. Richard F. Gyug, 'A Pontifical of Benevento', *Mediaeval Studies* 51 (1989) 355-423 at p. 395.

³⁰ See the facsimile in Kelly, *Beneventan Chant*, plate 15, and the references in note 22 above.

³¹ Hesbert ("Antiphonale missarum", 134) suggests that the Pater noster in Benevento 38 refers to a length of time for prayer and not to the prayer itself.

DESCRIPTION OF THE FRAGMENT

Conservation: Montecassino, Archivio della Badia, *Compactiones XVI* (*rotulus*, s. xii 3/4, Montecassino [?]). The fragment is contained in a large folder with the other items of *Compactiones XVI*; none of the individual fragments are distinguished by secondary folders, sub-signatures, or other labels.

Condition: The fragment is a single piece of parchment measuring 273 mm x 202 mm (h x w). The top edge is intact but no longer attached to a preceding frame; the left, right, and bottom edges are trimmed with loss of text. The parchment itself is medium-thick, flexible, and unblemished except by later use. Only the flesh-side was written on for the first use of the fragment; it is white to offwhite, with some stains at the top edge.

Binding slits for threading with a parchment strip survive along the top edge of the leaf (see Plate 1). Such slits are commonly used in other rolls and must be understood, in conjunction with the blank dorse, as demonstration that the fragment was either part of a roll or intended for use as part of roll. When later reused as a cover for a register, the leaf was folded and pierced at points along the fold for the new binding.

Layout: The parchment has been ruled in drypoint on the flesh side (written side) to form a single column of eleven surviving lines. The space between the rules is 21-22 mm; a twelfth rule at the top edge has not been written on. The written space has been trimmed at both sides but now measures 197 mm; the surviving height is 228 mm (cut at the bottom).

Script: The fragment is written by a single hand in Beneventan minuscule. The ink is brown-black, with some flaking characteristic of black carbon inks; the rubrics are orange, or orange with some brown. Concerning its date and origin, the size of the fragment must preclude any definite conclusions, although there are several indicative features. The stroke of *r* joining it to *e* or *a*, for instance, retains a distinct shoulder, unlike most late hands. The broken *c* is used, another early feature. Nonetheless, the general vertical compression would suggest a twelfth-century date, as would the long descenders in final *r*, the curved lower loop of *g* (line 5), and the sharp hair-line terminations on some descenders. The limited punctuation, consisting of a slightly raised point for final and medial stops, a point and hook for other stops, and a point with an added (?) hairstroke in line 9 for a final stop, does not provide a more precise indication of date.³² The few musical neumes are

³² Corrections, probably in the original hand, have been made through overwriting in darker ink (line 3 'noster'), erasure and rewriting (line 4 'A<.>unare' before correction, and 'Adunare' after). In lines 8-9 and 11 the musical notation has been erased and rewritten with the same melody (ut vid.) perhaps one interval lower. In line 10 a red 'Pater noster' has been erased; in line 10 the red 'ERigamus' is imperfectly erased: both appear to be later corrections.

placed between the rules above the text without other supports (no clefs, rules, etc.), although a direct (*custos*) is added at the end of line 11. The notes are diastematic and Beneventan, but do not present any complex or peculiar features.

Decoration: More telling of date in such a small sample are the decorative features, in particular the gold fields highlighting the opening phrases of each prayer and the interlace pattern of the initial *O*. The surviving initials, both trimmed, are formed from geometric interlaces without colour; the ink is brown-black. The first words of the prayers are written in a square Beneventan majuscule and set in gold fields. The top and bottom edges of fields are decorated with an egg-and-dart pattern with red base and blue or green eggs. Capitals are placed within the written space as required, formed from Beneventan majuscule, and coloured orange with brown.

The gold fields of the initial phrases appear in Cassinese manuscripts from the middle of the eleventh century. The egg-and-dart border of the fields is distinctive, but a similar pattern is used occasionally in Montecassino, Archivio della Badia 47, written between 1159 and 1173.³³ Most striking is a very close parallel in Montecassino 47, fol. 165v, for the interlace of the initial *O* of *Compactiones* xvi. The former is coloured and has flourishes outside the circle of the letter, but the elements of the interlace are otherwise the same (a small central circle, four larger circles touching at the centre, and two inscribed squares linking the circles). Several Exultet rolls preserve similar combinations of gold fields with coloured edges, the majuscule alphabet, and interlace initials, as one would expect in such deluxe manuscripts,³⁴ but none provide the precise comparisons afforded by Montecassino 47.

Date and Location: The fragment appears from its paleographic and decorative features to have been written in the third quarter of the twelfth century. The comparisons with Montecassino 47 and the Avezzano roll suggest Montecassino as a place of origin, although this also is very tentative, especially after the non-Cassinese liturgy of the 'Erigamus nos' is considered. One could turn, however, to scriptoria of dependent houses closer to the centre of the older liturgy, Benevento, for such a combination of rite and decoration. In that regard, the references on the dorse to the Cassinese dependency of S. Giovanni delle Monache of Capua would provide a plausible origin.³⁵ Under scrutiny, however, the

³³ Loew, *The Beneventan Script* 2.62, with a list of facsimiles, including E. A. Loew, *Scriptura beneventana: Facsimiles of South Italian and Dalmatian Manuscripts from the Sixth to the Fourteenth Century*, 2 vols. (Oxford, 1929), plate 88.

³⁴ Cf. Avezzano, Curia Vescovile S.N. (s. xi med., Montecassino; cf. Loew, *The Beneventan Script* 2.13); and London, BL Add. 30337 (s. xi ex.; Loew, *The Beneventan Script* 2.52): Avery (*Exultet Rolls* p. 19) remarks that the 'drawing was not at first intended to be colored'.

³⁵ On the monastery of S. Giovanni Battista delle Monache of Capua, see Herbert Bloch, *Monte Cassino in the Middle Ages*, 3 vols. (Cambridge, Mass., 1986), 1.495-570.

additions are not convincing in this indication of provenance. Certainly, the contents of the sixteenth-century Visitation which the fragment once covered refer to Capua but would have remained more suitably in the abbot's care than in the archive of the visited dependency (see Addition 2 below). While the modern note referring to S. Giovanni is explicit, it may also refer to the contents and not the provenance of the fragment (see Addition 4). It indicates only that *Compactiones* XVI once formed part of the Archive in *Capsula XXV* with other material dealing with S. Giovanni delle Monache though not necessarily originating there; these documents have now been placed in *Capsula XXVI*, where many still retain notes referring to the earlier classification.³⁶ It would seem, therefore, that the fragment is most likely to have been produced at Montecassino despite the conflicting use indicated by the 'Erigamus nos'.

Contents (The asterisks indicate the beginning and end of musical notation; see note 32 above for corrections and erasures):

face (flesh side), see Plate 1:

OREMUS DILECTISSIMI NO<BIS>
 PRO aecclesia sancta dei. Ut <eam>
 deus et dominus noster pa<cifi>
 care. Adunare. Et <custo>
 dire dignetur. toto <orbe>
 terrarum. Subiciens <ei>
 <princi>patus et potestates. Detque nobis quietam et <tran>
 <quilla>m uitam degentibus. *Glorificare deum pa<trem>
 <omnip>otentem. OREMVS* et dicat diaconus
 <*Flect>amus genua.* Pater noster. ERigamus nos.
 OMNIPOTENS SEMPITERNE DEUS

dorse (hair side), see Plate 2:

Originally blank, with the following later additions:

- (1) s. xiv-xv (perhaps written over a large erasure): In die veneris Sancta.
- (2) s. xvi, running vertically, the title of the register during the fragment's use as a cover: Visitatio facta in Ciuitate Capuae / in anno 1571
- (3) s. xvi, added below the title (2) in a similar hand but darker ink, italic: sacc.^o
- 69
- (4) modern italic, pencil: dal monasterio di S. Giovanni di Capua / Caps XXV.

Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies.

³⁶ For Montecassino, Archivio della Badia, Aula II: Caps. XXVI, see Tommaso Leccisotti, *I Regesti dell'Archivio. Abbazia di Montecassino*, vol. 6 (Rome, 1971), nos. 640-643, 645, 647. The papal letters (nos. 642, 643, 645) are instances of materials that deal with the dependency in Capua but have probably formed part of the Archive of Montecassino from the time of their production.

THE SOUTH-ITALIAN CANON LAW
COLLECTION IN FIVE BOOKS
AND ITS DERIVATIVES:
NEW EVIDENCE ON ITS ORIGINS,
DIFFUSION, AND USE

Roger E. Reynolds

IN an article entitled 'La reazione al "Decretum Burchardi" in Italia avanti la riforma gregoriana', Carlo Guido Mor contrasted the aims and diffusion of the *Decretum* of Burchard of Worms to those of indigenous Italian canon law collections before the Gregorian reform.¹ After characterizing Burchard's *Decretum*, Mor described various indigenous collections circulating in the Italian peninsula from the late ninth to the early eleventh century. Of special importance in central and southern Italy was what he styled the vade-mecum of canonists of that region, the *Collection in Five Books* (hereafter *5L*),² which Mor observed would remain the vade-mecum well into the Gregorian era.

Mor's characterization of the *5L* as the vade-mecum of Italian canonists of the eleventh century is curious indeed because, as he knew, there exist only three manuscripts of this collection, and all three are of substantial size and weight. Yet Mor's designation of the *5L* as a vade-mecum was apt in another sense because despite the physical cumbersomeness of the extant codices, the *5L* spawned a host of derivative compilations that in their size and content seem indeed to have been the handbook of many an eleventh- and even twelfth-century Italian canonist.

Since the publication in 1970 of Mario Fornasari's useful but flawed edition of the first three books of the *5L*,³ much has been written in reviews, articles, and books about not only the origins but also the character of the collection.⁴ It is the

¹ *Studi gregoriani* 1 (1947) 197-206.

² *ibid.*, p. 201.

³ *Collectio canonum in v libris (lib. i-iii)* (CCCM 6; Turnhout, 1970) [hereafter F]; on which see Gérard Fransen, 'Principes d'édition des collections canoniques', *Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique* 66 (1971) 125-36; and Hubert Mordek, 'Anzeigen', *Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte, kan. Abt.* 60 (1974) 477-78.

⁴ The more specialized literature will be dealt with below, but an example of a more recent general consideration of the collection may be found in Johannes Laudage, *Priesterbild und Reformpapsttum im 11. Jahrhundert* (Cologne-Vienna, 1984), pp. 78-83.

modest purpose of this article to assemble some of this material and to reexamine it in light of 1) new evidence, largely codicological and palaeographical, regarding its origins; 2) the hitherto suspected but unsubstantiated extensive diffusion of the collection; and 3) the character of the collection and its derivatives.

I. ORIGINS: CODICOLOGICAL AND PALAEOGRAPHICAL EVIDENCE

First, as to its origins, it is useful to summarize the conclusions of Fornasari and reactions to them. According to Fornasari the collection was probably compiled between 1014 and 1023 at Farfa for the priest Lupus, who is named in one of the prefaces.⁵ Although it had traditionally been said that the major indigenous source for the *5L* was the early tenth-century *Collection in Nine Books*, Fornasari claimed, rather, that it was the even earlier *Collection of Vallicelliana T. XVIII*.⁶ Probably the earliest codex of the *5L*, according to Fornasari, was the renowned eleventh-century Vatican codex, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana (hereafter BAV) Vat. lat. 1339, which he claimed was written at Farfa.⁷ A direct copy of this manuscript was made, according to Fornasari, at Monte Cassino (now Archivio della Badia 125) during the early abbacy of Theobald; and it was mentioned in the *Chronica Casinensis* of 1023.⁸ Probably dependent on this Cassino manuscript is the eleventh-century central Italian codex, Rome, Biblioteca Vallicelliana B 11.⁹

Fornasari's statements regarding the origins of the codices and their relationships were soon challenged and augmented by various scholars. Gérard Fransen was quick to point out that long ago the authors of the *Bibliotheca Casinensis* had associated Fornasari's priest Lupus with a travelling monk at Monte Cassino named in a colophon of the Monte Cassino codex.¹⁰ Moreover, Fransen suggested that the Vallicelliana codex was probably closer than any other to the original collection because 1) it preserves most clearly within the books the divisional rubrics that Fornasari often relegated to his apparatus; 2) the Vallicelliana codex is shorter than the other two manuscripts; and 3) the Vallicelliana codex does not contain the multiple interlinear glosses found in the Vatican and Monte Cassino manuscripts.¹¹

⁵ F, pp. xvii-xix.

⁶ F, pp. xiii f.

⁷ F, pp. vii f.

⁸ F, p. ix.

⁹ F, pp. ix f.

¹⁰ 'Principes', 130 f.

¹¹ 'Principes', 131-36.

Hubert Mordek then contributed several valuable pieces of information regarding the origins of the manuscripts of the collection.¹² First, he drew attention to the work of the art historian, E. B. Garrison, who had suggested that the famous Vatican manuscript was written at Narni in the second to third quarter of the eleventh century on the basis of a lost Farfese exemplar. Further, Mordek noted again the *Chronicon Casinensis* of 1023, which said that the abbot Theobald had made a *Liber canonum* for the poorly stocked library at Monte Cassino. But most important was Mordek's reference to the *Commemoratorium* of 1019 mentioning a *Liber canonum* which Theobald had had copied for the monastery of San Liberatore near Chieti as its provost before returning to Monte Cassino to become abbot there.

These contributions of Mordek were further developed by Theo Kölzer with several tantalizing suggestions.¹³ First, Kölzer speculated that there was a lost manuscript of the *5L* at Farfa, on which his own *Collection of the Farfa Register* was based.¹⁴ Moreover, he tentatively suggested that Theobald's *Liber canonum* at San Liberatore may even have been a copy of the *5L* which was carried to Monte Cassino to be used there as an exemplar for the extant Monte Cassino manuscript 125.¹⁵ And finally, Kölzer drew attention to the south Italian rather than Farfese origins of the *5L* by showing that one of the texts of Gregory I in the *5L* has readings of a Monte Cassino tradition.¹⁶

In light of additional palaeographical and codicological evidence, let us look at some of these observations regarding the origins of the collection. First, regarding the indigenous sources. Arguments have been made that both the *Collection of Vallicelliana T. XVIII* and the *Collection in Nine Books* of Vatican City, BAV Vat. lat. 1349 were sources of the *5L*, but it is unlikely that either manuscript could have been the direct source because both codices have been dated to the eleventh century¹⁷ – although the collections they contain are certainly earlier. Further, Fornasari's designation of the *Collection of Vallicelliana T. XVIII* as the source of the *5L* was based on the narrow evidence of a few Roman law texts;¹⁸ and it is clear

¹² Mordek, 'Anzeigen', 477-78; and *Kirchenrecht und Reform im Frankenreich. Die Collectio Vetus Gallica, die älteste systematische Kanonessammlung des fränkischen Gallien. Studien und Edition* (Beiträge zur Geschichte und Quellenkunde des Mittelalters 1; Berlin-New York, 1975), p. 100, notes 14 f.

¹³ *Collectio canonum Regesto Farfensi inserta*, ed. Theo Kölzer (Monumenta iuris canonici, Ser. B, Corpus collectionum 5; Vatican City, 1982).

¹⁴ *ibid.*, p. 54. It is possible, of course, that the *Collection of the Farfa Register* was based not on a complete manuscript of the *5L*, but on an excerptum of that collection.

¹⁵ *ibid.*, p. 54, note 128.

¹⁶ *ibid.*, pp. 50, note 111, and 222.

¹⁷ See E. A. Loew, *The Beneventan Script. A History of the South Italian Minuscule*, 2nd enlarged edition prepared by Virginia Brown, 2 vols. (Sussidi eruditi 33-34; Rome, 1980), 2.131, 145.

¹⁸ *F*, p. xiv.

that the *5L* contains numerous texts beyond these which are found in the *Collection in Nine Books* but not in the Vallicelliana collection. But here it is significant that the versions of a number of texts found in both the *5L* and *Collection in Nine Books* are much closer to recensions in yet another collection written in a manuscript predating the *5L* by almost a quarter century, the *Collection of Vatican Archivio San Pietro H 58*, written c. 1000.¹⁹ In short, the indigenous sources of the *5L* are more varied than any scholar has suspected. But what is perhaps most interesting is that the manuscripts of all these suggested sources are connected with southern Italy. The manuscript of the *Collection in Nine Books* is written in the Beneventan script of south Italy; the *Collection of Vallicelliana T. XVIII* was written in both Carolingian and Beneventan scripts probably not far south of Rome.²⁰ And even the codex Vatican, BAV Archivio San Pietro H 58, written in Rome itself, is filled with Beneventan-script symptoms and was clearly based on a south Italian exemplar.²¹

From the sources of the *5L* we now turn to the manuscripts of the collection itself. First, it must be stressed that none of the three extant manuscripts is a copy of either of the others. Although it has long been recognized that the collection is in two versions, a long and a short (and there is disagreement as to which manuscript contains which form²²), there is a plethora of variants which make suspect any claim that one of the codices is a 'direct' copy of the others or even of an 'original' manuscript of the collection. Moreover, even though the Vallicelliana manuscript is shorter than the other two, it contains texts that the others lack.

That any of the extant manuscripts was a direct copy of the others is even more unlikely because of their very disparate origins — although admittedly they could have been taken from place to place. While there is no controversy regarding the script of the Monte Cassino manuscript, there is a problem about its date. On the basis of the reference to a *Liber canonum* in the *Chronica Casinensis* and because of its ornamentation, the codex is generally dated to the early eleventh century or c. 1023.²³ E. A. Lowe, however, long ago pointed out that the abbreviations are

¹⁹ Roger E. Reynolds, 'A South Italian Liturgico-Canonical Mass Commentary', *Mediaeval Studies* 50 (1988) 642.

²⁰ Roger E. Reynolds, 'Odilo and the *Treuga Dei* in Southern Italy: A Beneventan Manuscript Fragment', *Mediaeval Studies* 46 (1984) 454, note 25.

²¹ See Roger E. Reynolds, 'South Italian *Liturgica* and *Canonistica* in Catalonia (New York, Hispanic Society of America MS. HC 380/819)', *Mediaeval Studies* 49 (1987) 487, and Paola Supino Martini, *Roma e l'area grafica romanesca (secoli X-XII)* (Biblioteca di Scrittura e civiltà 1; Alessandria, 1987), p. 74.

²² E.g., Paul Fournier, 'Un groupe de recueils canoniques italiens des x^e et xi^e siècles', *Mémoires de l'Institut national de France. Académie des inscriptions et belles-lettres* 40 (1916) 163 (rpt. in Paul Fournier, *Mélanges de droit canonique* ed. T. Kölzer, 2 vols. [Aalen, 1983], 2.213-331), holds that the Vatican and Vallicelliana manuscripts have the longer form; but Fransen, 'Principes', 136, says the Vallicelliana manuscript has the shorter version.

²³ E.g., Mordek, *Kirchenrecht*, p. 100, note 15.

more like those of the later eleventh century;²⁴ and with the general upward dating of Beneventan-script codices by Virginia Brown,²⁵ it is possible that this manuscript may have been written later than the 1020s.²⁶

There is, moreover, the renowned illustrated Vatican codex of the *5L*, Vatican, BAV Vat. lat. 1339. Fornasari's theory that the codex originated at Farfa has recently been bolstered by art historians who have compared the style of the copious illustrations preceding the collection itself to remnants of frescoes at Farfa.²⁷ As Horst Fuhrmann has suggested, however, the unnumbered quire on which these illustrations appear might not have been made for the present manuscript.²⁸ They may have been made for another manuscript of the *5L* or a similar compilation. More importantly, it is now the considered opinion of most

²⁴ Loew, *Beneventan Script* 1.211, 213.

²⁵ This has come about for several reasons. First, it is now known that the script was written well into the sixteenth century rather than ending in the fourteenth, and hence many of the codices that Lowe squeezed into earlier dates to fit his scheme must be dated later (see Virginia Brown, 'A Second New List of Beneventan Manuscripts (II)', *Mediaeval Studies* 50 [1988] 585). Second, Lowe did not take into account the results of musical palaeography, and specialists in Beneventan notation tend to date the codices in that script later than did Lowe. Third, it is clear now that Beneventan script was a very conservative one, in part because it was preeminently a liturgical one (see the review by Roger E. Reynolds of J. Mallet and A. Thibaut, *Les manuscrits en écriture bénéventaine de la Bibliothèque Capitulaire de Bénévent: Tome I, manuscrits 1-18* [Paris 1984] in the *The Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 36 [1985] 487), and hence manuscripts that appear to be early may in fact be later. E.g., it is interesting that Lowe dated to the twelfth century the Caiazzo (now Vatican) manuscript containing the Office of Corpus Christi composed by Thomas Aquinas after 1264; see E. A. Lowe, 'A New List of Beneventan Manuscripts' in *Collectanea vaticana in honorem Anselmi M. Card. Albareda a Bibliotheca Apostolica edita*, 2 vols. (Studi e testi 219-220; Vatican City, 1962), 2.218.

²⁶ For a more precise date we await the study of Francis Newton on the scribes of Monte Cassino.

²⁷ Charles B. McClendon, *The Imperial Abbey of Farfa. Architectural Currents of the Early Middle Ages* (Yale Publications in the History of Art 36; New Haven, 1987), pp. 80-82, 164 f., notes 21-23. Despite what he sees as the Farfese connections of the illuminations and frescoes, McClendon notes that Vat. lat. 1339 'seems to have been made for use in the neighboring town of Narni, and it may have been produced at one of Farfa's many dependencies there'. There is the alternative, of course, that the impressive illustrations on the quaternion fols. 7r-14v, bearing no quire number, were executed at Farfa and added to the remainder of the manuscript that was written in or near Narni.

²⁸ Horst Fuhrmann, 'Eine im Original erhaltene Propagandaschrift des Erzbischofs Gunthar von Köln (865)', *Archiv für Diplomatik* 4 (1958) 32, note 94. It should be added that in the four-bifolia quire containing the illustrations the measurements of the double-column are not quite as wide as they are elsewhere in the manuscript and that the vertical frame is shorter. On the illustrations themselves, see Roger E. Reynolds, 'Rites and Signs of Conciliar Decisions in the Early Middle Ages' in *Segni e riti nella Chiesa altomedievale occidentale* (Settimane di studio del Centro italiano di studi sull'alto medioevo 33; Spoleto, 1987), 215-21, and figs. 8-16. According to *A Catalogue of Canon and Roman Law Manuscripts in the Vatican Library, vol. I, Codices Vaticani latini 541-2299* (compiled under the direction of Stephan Kuttner and Reinhard Elze [Studi e testi 322; Vatican City, 1987], p. 74), drawings of the fallen heretics were added to the conciliar illustrations in the fourteenth century, but an inspection of the codex shows that these were drawn over the faded original drawings of the fallen heretics.

palaeographers that the manuscript was probably written not at Farfa but in or near Narni in typical 'romanesca' script about the middle of the eleventh century.²⁹ Further, it is also clear that the codex was based on a south Italian Beneventan-script exemplar because it is filled with abbreviations and punctuation marks of that script.³⁰ Moreover, it is interesting that in the quire with a patristic florilegium preceding the collection itself, there is a text which also appears in a Beneventan-script section of the codex Vallicelliana T. XXI.³¹

The third extant codex of the *5L*, Rome, Biblioteca Vallicelliana B 11, has received the least attention from canonistic scholars, yet it is perhaps the most intriguing of the manuscripts from a palaeographical and codicological standpoint. First, we know exactly where it was written and the name of one of the major scribes. It was written at Sant'Eutizio in Val Castoriana not far from Norcia by Ubertus, a very productive scribe and then abbot of that Benedictine house, whose death is recorded by at least 1087.³² His promotion from scribe to abbot may explain such features of the manuscript as its incompleteness and the virtual lack of the interlinear glosses that characterize the other codices of the *5L* and its derivatives.³³ Perhaps just as interesting, a close codicological and palaeographical examination suggests that the manuscript may be made up of two codices of the *5L*, the first of which contains fragments of the prefaces and the *capitulatio* for the first book of the collection.³⁴ This takes on added significance since the earliest

²⁹ Supino Martini, *Roma*, p. 229. Despite this palaeographical evidence, there remains the possibility that a scribe from Narni itself or nearby executed this deluxe codex in or for Farfa itself. (It is interesting that the other two 'complete' extant manuscripts of the *5L* were made for the major Benedictine abbeys of Monte Cassino and Sant'Eutizio in the Val Castoriana.) Later the manuscript might have been taken to Narni where the notations for its provenance of Narni were entered on fols. 1r, 6r, 205v, and 315r.

³⁰ Reynolds, 'South Italian *Liturgica*', 488, note 25.

³¹ fol. 53v; and cf. Vat. lat. 1339, fol. 6r.

³² Supino Martini, *Roma*, p. 205.

³³ The Vallicelliana manuscript does have some glosses. The prefaces of books 3, 4, and 5, fols. 99r, 154r, and 234r, all have copious glosses; and in the first few canons of book 2, fols. 58r-59r, the scribe has begun to enter glosses like those of the Vatican and Cassino manuscripts. (It is interesting here that the Vallicelliana and Cassino glosses are closer than the Vallicelliana and Vatican glosses.) It almost appears as if the original intention was to gloss the canons, but that the scribe for some reason — loss of interest, other duties, promotion from scribe to abbot, or whatever — failed to complete his task.

³⁴ The first codex is represented in fols. 1r-3v of the Vallicelliana manuscript. Although Supino Martini (*Roma*, p. 205, note 14) sees the hand of Ubertus, the primary scribe of the remainder of the manuscript, in fols. 1r-3v, the hand appears to be different. Ubertus wrote in a blackish-brown ink and used orange for his rubrics. His letters, bold and large, include a distinctive 3-shaped *z*, a round-bottomed *g*, and a suprascript *s* for the final *s* of a word. But the most distinctive feature of his hand are letters on the bottom lines of folios that Fornasari described as being influenced by charter styles, but that might also be called 'dripping' letters because they descend into the lower margin. The dripping letters themselves are an eccentricity particularly of the scriptorium of S. Eutizio from the second to fourth quarter of the eleventh century (on which see E. B. Garrison, *Studies in*

twelfth-century inventory of books at Sant'Eutizio speaks of a *Liber canonum* and a *Liber alius canonum*.³⁵ This second reference may, of course, be to one of several

the *History of Mediaeval Italian Painting*, 4 vols. [Florence, 1953], 2.121 f.), but Ubertus' are especially noticeable because they end in a curve or sickle-shape. The scribe responsible for fols. 1r-3v with the *capitulatio* of book 1 of the 5L has a distinctive *r-i* ligature very close to that of Ubertus, but he used minuscule, not uncial *d*'s. Nor did he use 'dripping' letters. Further, the ink used is a much lighter brown than that in the major portion of the manuscript (although this, of course, does not in itself indicate a different hand).

As the Vallicelliana manuscript now exists, the first two paper fly-leaves inserted at the Biblioteca Vallicelliana bear the modern title and contents of the manuscript. The title on fol. 11r reads *Collectio canonum in quinque libros divisa sancto Isidoro episc. hispalen. falso tributa cum praefatione eiusdem s. Isidori auctore anonymo graeco-italo noni vel decimi seculi I. C. Qui monachum se prodit in suis praefationibus*; and the monastic reference makes one wonder if this is an allusion to the *frater* of the preface of the collection now cut away from the manuscript. After the two paper leaves, there are three parchment folios with the *capitulatio* of book 1 written by a hand similar to but different from that of Ubertus. The *capitulatio* breaks off with c. 202, not c. 164, as does the Vatican manuscript of the 5L. Originally the first quire of the Vallicelliana codex consisted not of three parchment folios but of three, or perhaps four, bifolia. What may have been the first of these four bifolia is now a small rectangular piece of parchment attached to what remains of the second bifolium. This bifolium is in turn a very narrow v-shaped strip, the left-hand portion of which is bound around or before the two modern paper folios, and the right-hand portion of which, originally containing the remainder of the *capitulatio* of book 1, is glued to support what is left of the third bifolium. What was the third bifolium is now a single folio, the left-hand portion of which is bound around or before the two paper folia, and the right-hand portion of which is now fol. 3. The fourth or innermost bifolium of the original first quire of the manuscript now makes up fols. 1-2 of the manuscript. What remains of this mutilated first quire of the Vallicelliana manuscript is of special importance for several reasons. On the recto side of the original left-hand section of the second bifolium (i.e., the small v-shaped strip now bound before the two paper leaves and glued as a support for the present fol. 3), there are still visible parts of three large letters. At the top of the thin strip there is an 'I' written on what was probably the first line, corresponding in the 5L to 'In Christi nomine' or 'Incipit prologus libri canonum' of Fornasari's Prefatio or I. — Praepatio. (F, p. 13). Below this there is the curve of a letter rubricated in orange, probably corresponding to the 'O' of 'Oportuni' (Fornasari's I. — Praepatio; F, p. 13). And two thirds of the way down the strip is a curved part of another rubricated letter, probably corresponding to the 'C' of 'Cernimus' (Fornasari's II. — Praepatio; F, p. 14). Given the length of this preface, it is probable that the text covered the remainder of this folio and the succeeding folio (the left-hand strip of the existing fol. 3, now bound around the two paper leaves), and was then followed on the present fols. 1-3 by the *capitulatio* for book 1 of the collection. The second significant feature of this mutilated first quire is that the numbers assigned to the *capitula* in the *capitulatio* do not correspond to those in book 1 of the collection. They are, in fact, consistently off by one number. Such numerical disparity between canons in *capitulationes* and books of a collection in the early Middle Ages is not at all uncommon. There is, however, another possibility suggested by the fact that the scribe of this first quire appears to have written only this portion of the manuscript; to wit, that this first quire was made for a now lost manuscript of the 5L, which was perhaps either a model for or a copy of our codex, and was later attached to the remainder of the manuscript written by Ubertus and other scribes. This first quire, written by the different hand, could have been used to replace a worn-out first quire, which probably bore the signature 'i'. (The first signature in the manuscript, 'iii' on fol. 18v, is for the quire fols. 11-18. The signature 'ii' for the quire beginning on fol. 4 would have been on a now missing folio making up a bifolium whose left-hand section is fol. 4 and whose right-hand section consists of two tiny fragments after fol. 10v).

³⁵ Rome, Biblioteca Vallicelliana T. I, fol. viii' (on which see Pietro Pirri, *L'abbazia di Santi*

derivative collections of the *5L*, which, as we shall see, were written at Sant'Eutizio. It is also possible that it refers to a second copy of the *5L*, part of which was joined to the section of the manuscript written by Ubertus.

While the south Italian connections of the Monte Cassino and Vatican manuscripts of the *5L* are abundantly clear, traces of these connections also are found in the Sant'Eutizio codex. There are texts in this manuscript that appear in the Monte Cassino codex and not in the Vatican manuscript.³⁶ Perhaps more importantly, the scribe who added marginalia to the Sant'Eutizio manuscript also used a number of Beneventan conventions.³⁷

There is, finally, a fragment of a manuscript, seemingly hitherto unnoticed in the literature on the *5L*, that may be a witness to a lost codex of the collection. This single folio is buried in a volume of Hebrew, Greek, and Latin fragments in Rome, Biblioteca Vallicelliana R 32.³⁸ The fragment contains not only consecutive canons from the *5L* (1.212-19, 220-24), but also a divisional rubric like one found in the Vallicelliana manuscript of the *5L* (1.213: 'Incipit de iudicio in primis'). Further, it contains virtually all of the interlinear glosses of the Vatican and Monte Cassino manuscripts of the *5L*. Although it may be that this folio comes from a derivative collection of the *5L*, there are several other indicia that suggest a manuscript of the *5L* itself. First, the folio, even though cropped, is a large one,³⁹ more like the manuscripts of the *5L* than its derivatives, which are often smaller.⁴⁰ Secondly, its extensive texts and glosses are virtually identical to those in the extant full manuscripts of the *5L*. Thirdly, this fragment has preserved a divisional rubric characteristic of the complete manuscripts. And fourthly, there are in the cropped margins of the folio traces of chapter numbers which bear a distant resemblance to those of the Vatican manuscript of the *5L*.⁴¹ Although this single folio is written in a central Italian script and has numerous parallels to the complete Vatican and Vallicelliana manuscripts of the *5L*, it also bears traces of south Italian influence.

Eutizio in Val Castoriana presso Norcia e le chiese dipendenti, 2nd edition [Studia Anselmiana 45; Rome, 1960], pp. 347 f.).

³⁶ E.g., the Vallicelliana and Cassino manuscripts have an additional preface (*De confirmatione*), which Fornasari reported in the former but not in the latter codex (F, pp. 18, 4).

³⁷ This Carolingian hand has correctly used the Beneventan *ti* ligatures on fols. 21v and 52r (53r). On fol. 60r (61r) there is a marginal entry using normal uncial *a*'s but the Beneventan *e*, correct *ti* ligatures, and unions of *ec* and *en*.

³⁸ fol. 50 (32u and 52u).

³⁹ 269 x 190 mm.

⁴⁰ The abbreviated derivative of the *5L* in Naples (Biblioteca Nazionale Vittorio Emanuele III, XII A 28), for example, is a mere 195 x 120 mm. (140 x 100 mm.).

⁴¹ E.g., next to the rubric *De personis eligendis ad iudicium* (F, p. 132) there remains an *xx* that is closer to the *ccxviii* of Vat. lat. 1339, fol. 54r, than the *cxcviii* in Vallicelliana B 11, fol. 45v; and next to the rubric *De eo quod iudicia* (F, p. 133) there is half an *x* together with *xi*, which is closer to the *ccxx* of Vat. lat. 1339, fol. 54r than the *cc* of the Vallicelliana codex, fol. 45v.

There are Beneventan abbreviations and conventional signs,⁴² and the misspelling of several words probably arose from misreadings of a Beneventan-script model with its strangely formed letters and ligatures.⁴³

*
* * *

In the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, the origins of the *5L* were established largely according to internal criteria. Gaudenzi, for example, argued for Ravenna on the basis of the canons in the collection attributed to the German emperor, Henry II.⁴⁴ Fournier suggested the triangle of Monte Cassino-Benevento-Naples because of its dependency on the *Collection in Nine Books*, generally said to be from the Naples-Benevento area.⁴⁵ Fornasari, using palaeographical evidence, then located the origins of the collection in Farfa. Thus far it will have been seen that the palaeographical and codicological evidence strongly suggests Italy south of Rome. It may be that Fournier's points of the triangle have to be changed from Monte Cassino-Benevento-Naples to one encompassing the area south of Rome to Chieti to Monte Cassino, but in any event palaeographical evidence suggests that the origins are to be found in south Italy.

II. DERIVATIVES OF THE *COLLECTION IN FIVE BOOKS*: PAST RESEARCH AND NEW EVIDENCE

For Fournier the surest sign of the importance of the *5L* in the history of canon law was its influence on later collections; and he was able to list over a dozen, each in a single codex.⁴⁶ It would be superfluous here to rehearse his descriptions of the

⁴² E.g., there are such Beneventan-Insular uses as the suprascript ' for a final *s* (see Loew, *Beneventan Script* 1.213) and *f* for *secundum* (see Loew, *Beneventan Script* 1.193). The conventional sign)-(, an Insular abbreviation somewhat like the legal)) of Beneventan script meaning *contra*, is also used, and the scribe has found it necessary to gloss it (cf. Loew, *Beneventan Script* 1.160).

⁴³ E.g., the text reads *malorum* for *maiorum* probably because the scribe mistook the I-longa of his Beneventan model for an *i*. (see Loew, *Beneventan Script* 1.302, 308 f.). Our text also reads *qui nato modo* rather than *quinto modum*, a mistake that could have arisen from a misreading of a Beneventan model with its union of the letters *nt* (see Loew, *Beneventan Script* 1.139, 149). Also perhaps a model with a Beneventan-Insular sign 7 for *et* (see Loew, *Beneventan Script* 1.180) led the scribe to write such curiosities as *zanimis* for *et animis* or *zalibi* for *et alibi*.

⁴⁴ A. Gaudenzi, 'Lo svolgimento parallelo del diritto longobardo e del diritto romano', *Memorie della R. Accademia delle scienze dell'Istituto di Bologna, classe di scienze morali, Sezione giuridica, Ser. I* (1908), 61 f.

⁴⁵ Fournier, 'Un groupe', 152, 188.

⁴⁶ Paul Fournier's most extensive treatments of these derivatives are found in 'Un groupe', 190-208 and 'De l'influence de la collection irlandaise sur la formation des collections canoniques', *Nouvelle revue historique de droit français et étranger* 23 (1899) 64-71; and Paul Fournier and Gabriel Le Bras, *Histoire des collections canoniques en occident depuis les Fausses Décrétales jusqu'au Décret de Gratien*, 2 vols. (Paris, 1931-32), 1.444-54 and 2.116-27.

borrowings from the *5L* in each derivative, but it is useful to analyze their major structural characteristics and the types of combinations made with material from the *5L* and other collections.

The most easily recognized type of derivative collection is one in which the *5L* is combined with material from Burchard's *Decretum*. This point was noted in the article cited above by Carlo Guido Mor, who stressed that very quickly after the compilation of the *5L*, parts of it were combined with the *Corrector* of Burchard in particular and to a lesser extent with material from other books in the *Decretum*.⁴⁷ Mor did not adequately stress, however, the extent of this blending. Of the more than a dozen derivative collections described by Fournier, nine contain extracts from Burchard,⁴⁸ and seven of these borrow from the *Corrector*.⁴⁹ The *5L* itself had extensive sections dealing with penance, but it appears that the usefulness of the selection of canons in the *Corrector* was seen as superior or more complete than the *5L*, and thus the *Corrector* was used in southern and central Italy to augment the penitential sections of the *5L*.

Another category of derivative collection described by Fournier might be styled as an abbreviated type, and there are two forms of this type. In the first, the number of canons taken from the *5L* is fewer, but they are maintained basically in the sequence followed in the *5L*. Thus, the small codex, Naples, Biblioteca Nazionale Vittorio Emanuele III, XII A 8, is a collection in five books with the number of canons from the *5L* vastly reduced.⁵⁰ In the other abbreviated form, the canons are spread over more than five books and are often arranged according to the divisional rubrics in the *5L* itself. For example, the Florentine *Collectio Riccardiana* is a compilation whose seventeen books or parts are divided largely according to the divisional rubrics of the *5L*.⁵¹

A third category of derivative collection described by Fournier might be called a farraginous type or one in which canons from the *5L* are thrown together helter-skelter or combined with canons from other collections in no discernible order. An example of this would be the south Italian *Collection of Veroli*.⁵²

⁴⁷ Mor, 'La reazione', 202 f.

⁴⁸ Florence, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana 4, sin. 4; Florence, Biblioteca Riccardiana 300; Monte Cassino, Archivio della Badia 216; Rome, Biblioteca Vallicelliana F 2, F 8, F 92; Vatican, BAV Vat. lat. 3830, 4977, 8487.

⁴⁹ Florence, Biblioteca Riccardiana 300; Monte Cassino, Archivio della Badia 216; Rome, Biblioteca Vallicelliana F 2, F 8, F 92; Vatican, BAV Vat. lat. 3830, 4977.

⁵⁰ On the size of this codex see above, note 39.

⁵¹ Florence, Biblioteca Riccardiana 300. The seventeen books or parts were so designated in J. Lamius, *Catalogus codicum manuscriptorum qui in Bibliotheca Riccardiana Florentina adservantur* (Livorno, 1756), pp. 129-33, but they are not actually numbered in the manuscript. The canons collected under the divisional rubrics, however, might be styled as books or parts.

⁵² Rome, Biblioteca Vallicelliana B 32, especially fols. 154r-158v.

That the influence of the *5L* penetrated even the collections of the Gregorian reform is seen in a fourth type of compilation. In the small codex, Rome, Biblioteca Vallicelliana F 54, the *Collection in 74 Titles* is augmented by a vast florilegium of patristic texts and canons from the *5L*, the latter largely from the 'penitential' books of the *5L*.⁵³

Finally, among the derivative collections described by Fournier, it is noteworthy that three are associated with liturgical material. Thus, the *Collectio Riccardiana* has an *ordo missae*,⁵⁴ the *Collection of Vallicelliana F 2* an *expositio missae*,⁵⁵ and the *Collection of Vallicelliana E 62* a missal-ritual combined with extracts from book 5 of the *5L*.⁵⁶

In his major study of these derivative collections, Fournier stressed that they all had their origins in the area from Umbria southward to Naples.⁵⁷ Later, however, he pointed to what he thought was the influence of the *5L* in the north of Italy, specifically in the *Collectio Veronensis*.⁵⁸ Peter Landau has more recently demonstrated that the *5L* was not used in this collection,⁵⁹ but the influence of the collection may have reached northern Italy inasmuch as Giorgio Picasso's *Collectio Ambrosiana II* contains several concordances of canons also found in the *5L*.⁶⁰

In concluding his major study of the derivatives of the *5L* Fournier acknowledged that his enumeration was far from complete and invited further investigation.⁶¹ Indeed, more recent discoveries have virtually doubled Fournier's number of derivative collections. The types of these additional collections also resemble those Fournier has described.

The combination of the *5L* and Burchard's *Decretum*, especially the *Corrector*, is represented in the small *Collectio Toletana*, edited recently by John Douglas Adamson.⁶² This manuscript was long classified in Toledo simply as a theological one, but it was Antonio García y García who noted its canonistic character,

⁵³ fols. 67r-169v.

⁵⁴ On the *ordo missae* in the Riccardiana codex, see Adalbert Ebner, *Quellen und Forschungen zur Geschichte und Kunstgeschichte des Missale Romanum im Mittelalter: Iter Italicum* (Freiburg i. Br., 1896), pp. 300-302.

⁵⁵ fols. 101v-102v; and cf. Fournier, 'Un groupe', 198.

⁵⁶ See Fournier, 'Un groupe', 199.

⁵⁷ Fournier, 'Un groupe', 209.

⁵⁸ Verona, Biblioteca Capitolare LXIV (62); and see Fournier and Le Bras, *Histoire* 2.117 f.

⁵⁹ 'Die *Collectio Veronensis*', *Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte, kan. Abt.* 67 (1981) 85 f.

⁶⁰ *Collezioni canoniche milanesi del secolo xii* (Pubblicazioni dell'Università Cattolica del S. Cuore, Saggi e ricerche, 3rd Ser., Scienze storiche 2; Milan, 1969), pp. 32, 95, 110, 112 f., 115, 117 f., 122, 140 f.

⁶¹ Fournier, 'Un groupe', 209.

⁶² Toledo, Biblioteca Capitular 22-32, now edited by John Douglas Adamson, *The Collectio Toletana* (M.S.L. Report; Toronto, 1987).

especially the Burchardian material.⁶³ Much more numerous are the canons borrowed from the *5L*, 232 out of 376, the majority from books 4 and 5.

Two newly identified collections are examples of the two sub-forms of the abbreviated derivatives of the *5L*. First the manuscript of the *Collection of Rieti*⁶⁴ is mutilated at the beginning and the end, but what remains — extracts from books 3 and 4 of the *5L* — tends to indicate that this collection largely followed the arrangement of the *5L* itself. The other new collection, the Roman *Collectio Angelica*,⁶⁵ is also mutilated at beginning and end, but it contained at least thirteen books. The canons are generally presented in the order in which they are found in the *5L*, but occasionally the compiler has reordered them, often according to their divisional rubrics in the *5L*. Perhaps the most striking thing about the canons drawn from the *5L* in this collection, however, is that at times their readings and inscriptions follow none of the extant manuscripts of the *5L*. For example, a canon attributed to the German emperor, Henry II, in the extant manuscripts of the *5L* is attributed in the *Collectio Angelica* to Charlemagne and contains a text longer than the one presently known.⁶⁶ Moreover, added to the famous canon of Henry II on shipwrecks is a further canon attributed to the emperor that does not appear in any of the extant manuscripts of the *5L*.⁶⁷

The third type of derivative collection, the farraginous variety, is represented in yet another section of Vallicelliana T. XXI, this time apparently connected with Sant'Eutizio.⁶⁸ In this derivative the excerptor skips freely about the *5L* for his

⁶³ Antonio García y García, 'Canonistica Hispanica (II)', *Traditio* 23 (1967) 504 f.

⁶⁴ Rieti, Archivio Capitolare 5, on which see Roger E. Reynolds, 'Basil and the Early Medieval Latin Canonical Collections' in *Basil of Caesarea: Christian, Humanist, Ascetic. A Sixteen-Hundredth Anniversary Symposium*, ed. Paul Jonathan Fedwick (Toronto, 1981), 528.

⁶⁵ Rome, Biblioteca Angelica 1447.

⁶⁶ Rome, Biblioteca Angelica 1447, p. 94: 'De eo qui pignus auri vel argenti vel domum acceperit de ornamentis ecclesiae. Karolus Rex'; cf. *5L* 4.283; ed. Ludwig Weiland, *MGH Constitutiones et acta publica imperatorum et regum* 1 (Hanover, 1893), p. 62, taken from Vat. lat. 1339, fol. 216; 4.283.

⁶⁷ Rome, Biblioteca Angelica 1447, pp. 202-203. There is first the canon 'Siquis de naufragio post evasionem maris. Ex iudicio Enrici regis cxxvi' (= *5L* 3.211: F, pp. 412 f.), after which comes 'cxxvii. De incendiis domorum. Idem ipse Enricus, Unde supra. Simili damnatione constringantur ... maneat innodatum'.

⁶⁸ fols. 284r-302v. Supino Martini (*Roma*, pp. 305 f.) designates this section of the manuscript among her 'mss non localizzati', although she notes similarities with manuscripts and texts from Sant'Eutizio. Among the more important palaeographical features common to this manuscript and those of Sant'Eutizio are the 'dripping letters'. In T. XXI these are not of the type used in Vallicelliana B 11 and its close associates, but more like those of Rome, Biblioteca Vallicelliana B 4 and C 10, pt. 2, fols. 139r-279v, both manuscripts from Sant'Eutizio and dating to the end of the eleventh century. In these manuscripts the dripping letters end not with the sickle-shaped curve, but with a graceful sinuous flourish, which at times loops over itself. Beyond the palaeographical features, there is also internal evidence in the texts of the quires containing our excerptum that links them to Sant'Eutizio or perhaps one of her dependencies. The quires contain both the canonical excerptum, beginning in the middle of the second quire (fol. 284r) and running to the end of the fourth quire (fol. 302v), and what the modern catalogue calls 'litanies', running from fol. 271r to 283v. Actually

sources: a few from book 1, several from book 3, back to book 1, then book 4, and so forth. In most cases the number of canons from the *5L* does not extend beyond three or four in sequence. Whether the excerptor depended on a manuscript of the *5L* itself or another farraginous collection of canons is not clear. In any case, the variants are similar to those of the extant Vallicelliana manuscript of the *5L* from Sant'Eutizio, although glosses, different inscriptions, and canons not found in this latter codex indicate that it could not have been the direct source.

Related to this farraginous collection in Vallicelliana T. XXI are two small farraginous excerpta in yet another manuscript written at Sant'Eutizio, Rome, Biblioteca Vallicelliana B 63.⁶⁹ In one section of the codex a scribe has entered a number of canons from book 3 of the *5L*.⁷⁰ In another section a different scribe has copied yet another section from book 3 as well as a number of glosses apparently drawn from canons in book 5 of the *5L*.⁷¹ In the canons from book 3 a recension of the *5L* like the extant Sant'Eutizio codex was used, but the glosses could not have been borrowed from that source.

Perhaps most surprising among the newly identified derivatives of the *5L* is the number involving combinations of extracts from the *5L* and the *Collection in 74 Titles*. Fournier identified only one manuscript of this type of combination,⁷² but to this four more can be added.⁷³ In three cases canons from the *5L* have simply

these 'litanies' are an abbreviated martyrology, and it is in their contents that the connections of the quires with Sant'Eutizio are clear. In this martyrology the scribe has capitalized a number of his entries or has underlined them in yellow. Among these are Eutizio (with yellow underlining; added later in a small hand; fol. 276r) and a number of feasts of Spoleto (capitalized; fol. 283v), in whose diocese Sant'Eutizio lay. Also on fol. 283r, a scribe has added in large black letters the name of 'Thomas Abbot' (of Farfa, c. 680-720), who was venerated at Sant'Eutizio. Garrison (*Studies* 2.124 and 4.165 f., 218, 237, 251) has pointed out that such entries as these can be found in a number of central Italian liturgical books not originating at Sant'Eutizio. But the case for an origin at Sant'Eutizio is strengthened if our martyrology in T. XXI is compared with a longer one in Rome, Biblioteca Vallicelliana E 59, whose contents Pirri (*L'abbazia*, pp. 359 f.) has described among his manuscripts from Sant'Eutizio and where the dedication of the basilica of Sant'Eutizio is noted in large rubricated letters on fol. 59v. In Vallicelliana E 59, the hand is not far removed from those at Sant'Eutizio at the end of the eleventh century, and as in our quires of T. XXI, there is the suprascript *s* for the final *s* and dripping letters occasionally with a 'flaming letter' rising into the upper margin (see Garrison, *Studies* 2.122). If the long martyrology of Vallicelliana E 59 is compared with the shorter one in our T. XXI, there are a few differences, but the correspondences are even more striking. Among these are the names of Eutizio, which is both capitalized and rubricated, and Thomas Abbot, whose *depositio* is placed on 10 December. Also there are the Spoleto entries in both martyrologies.

⁶⁹ Supino Martini, *Roma*, pp. 201-223.

⁷⁰ fol. 218r-v.

⁷¹ fol. 217r-v. These were written by the same hand that was responsible for additions on fols. 218v-219r.

⁷² Rome, Biblioteca Vallicelliana F 54 (see Fournier, 'Un groupe', 191 f.).

⁷³ El Escorial, Real Biblioteca de San Lorenzo Z.III.19, fols. 79v-116r; Monte Cassino, Archivio della Badia 522, pp. 179-95; Rome, Biblioteca Angelica 1447, pp. 210-12; and Rome, Biblioteca Casanatense 2010, fols. 142v-172r.

been included in florilegia of patristic canons appended to manuscripts used by John T. Gilchrist for his edition of the *Collection in 74 Titles*,⁷⁴ with perhaps a recognition that the *74 Titles* was too narrow in its scope and had to be augmented with canons from an older source. In the other case, the *Collectio Angelica* just described, canons from the *74 Titles* have been appended to a derivative of the *5L*,⁷⁵ this time perhaps a recognition that the older *5L* was too narrow and had to be updated with new material from a Gregorian reform collection.

The combination of canons from the *5L* with liturgical material is also represented in the recently identified derivatives. In one case, canons from book 1 of the *5L* have been combined to form an ordination allocution that is inserted into a Pontifical of Chieti, Vatican City, BAV Vat. lat. 7818.⁷⁶ And in this connection, it should be remembered that Theobald, who was abbot of San Liberatore near Chieti, may have had a *Liber canonum* made in his monastery there before the *Liber canonum* he had made later for his abbey of Monte Cassino. In another case, canons from the *5L* have been used with large numbers of liturgical expositions and theological and patristic texts to form a *Liber multiloquiorum in Seven Books*, written perhaps in or near Farfa or a Farfese dependency.⁷⁷

Just as significant as the large number of derivatives of the *5L*, both those described by Fournier and those more recently identified, are their origins and connections with the extant manuscripts of the *5L*. Fournier stressed that those he knew originated largely from Umbria southward to Naples; but he failed to emphasize fully the extent of their connections with south Italy. Of the manuscripts known to him, Fournier noted only one as being written in Beneventan script.⁷⁸ In reality six of his are written in this script.⁷⁹ The Neapolitan abbreviated derivative, moreover, is filled with Beneventan-script symptoms, and the *Collection of Vat. lat. 3830*, despite its having been written in north central Italy, contains a number of texts from the southern part of the peninsula.⁸⁰ When we turn to our recently identified derivatives, the connections with southern Italy continue to be striking. Four of the manuscripts, in whole or in part, were written in Beneventan

⁷⁴ The three manuscripts cited in note 73, with the exception of Biblioteca Angelica 1447. See *Diversorum patrum sententiae sive Collectio in LXXIV titulos digesta* ed. John T. Gilchrist (Monumenta iuris canonici, Ser. B, Corpus collectionum 1; Vatican City, 1973), pp. xxxii-xxxiv, xliii f., xlv f.

⁷⁵ These correspond to *74T* 1.1-11; Gilchrist, *Diversorum patrum*, pp. 19-25.

⁷⁶ For an edition and study of this allocution in Vatican, BAV Vat. lat. 7818, see Roger E. Reynolds, 'A South Italian Ordination Allocution', *Mediaeval Studies* 47 (1985) 438-44.

⁷⁷ On the *Liber multiloquiorum* see Reynolds, 'A South Italian Liturgico-Canonical Mass Commentary', 662.

⁷⁸ Rome, Biblioteca Vallicelliana F 54 (cf. Fournier, 'Un groupe', 191).

⁷⁹ Madrid, Biblioteca Nacional 373; Monte Cassino, Archivio della Badia 216; Rome, Biblioteca Vallicelliana B 32, F 2, F 8, F 54.

⁸⁰ Cf. Supino Martini, *Roma*, pp. 315 f. and Stephan Kuttner, 'The Council of Carthage 535: A Supplementary Note', *Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte, kan. Abt.* 73 (1987) 347, note 6.

script,⁸¹ while an additional two have Beneventan-script symptoms.⁸² In short, over half of the twenty-five derivatives identified thus far were written in the south Italian Beneventan script or contain symptoms thereof.

Connections with the abbey of Sant'Eutizio and the region around Farfa, which both produced extant manuscripts of the *5L*, are also strong in the derivatives. Fournier knew that one of his derivatives came from each of these locations.⁸³ Of the recently identified derivatives, two came from or were associated with Sant'Eutizio while one originated in Farfa or the vicinity.⁸⁴

III. THE CHARACTER OF THE *COLLECTION IN FIVE BOOKS* AND ITS DERIVATIVES

As with most collections compiled in the eleventh century, the *5L* has traditionally been understood primarily in relation to the so-called Gregorian reforms. As such, it has been styled a reforming collection before the reform, a collection with many of the same aims as the *Decretum* of Burchard but distinctively Italian in character. Without disputing this traditional view, this article will conclude by suggesting several other possible characterizations of the collection and its derivatives in light of more recent scholarship.

First, it must be stressed that the formats of the three extant manuscripts of the collection suggest that from the beginning the *5L* was acknowledged to be in the process of growth, with augmentation possible. In the Vallicelliana manuscript, for example, spaces have been left at various points, where later hands have at times added canons and texts of various types.⁸⁵ The scribe of the Vatican manuscript systematically left blank spaces after divisions of canons almost as an invitation for further additions.⁸⁶ Second, while it is undeniable that the *5L* is preeminently a collection of canons, it can also be regarded as another type of textual florilegium, particularly of patristic texts. In part, this came about because one of the ultimate sources of the collection, the Irish *Collectio canonum hibernensis*, was itself filled with extracts from the patristic fathers, and these were incorporated into the *5L*.

⁸¹ El Escorial, Real Biblioteca de San Lorenzo Z.III.19; Monte Cassino, Archivio della Badia 522; Rieti, Archivio Capitolare 5; and Vatican, BAV Vat. lat. 7818.

⁸² Toledo, Biblioteca Capitular 22-32 and Vatican, BAV Vat. lat. 4317.

⁸³ Rome, Biblioteca Vallicelliana F 92, and Vatican, BAV Vat. lat. 8487; Fournier, 'Un groupe', 195, 204.

⁸⁴ Rome, Biblioteca Vallicelliana B 63, and T. XXI and Vatican, BAV Vat. lat. 4317.

⁸⁵ Blank spaces are found on fols. 12r-v, 56v-57v, 75r-v, 99r-v, 104v, 153v, 162r-v, 188v-189r, 189r, 192r, 233v, 235r-v. It could, of course, have been that the scribe was simply reproducing the blank spaces of the archetype.

⁸⁶ fols. 25v, 40r, 52r, 69r, 104r-105r, 108r, 113r, 113v, 129v, 141v, 143r, 144v, 151v, 157r, 160v, 177r, 184r, 189r, 195v, 201v, 207v, 208r, 210v, 212r, 214v, 221r, 223r, 224r, 241r, 243v, 250v, 253r, 275v, 297v, 301r, 302v, 304v, 305r, 309r.

The compilers of the *5L* also included many additional patristic texts, both authentic and pseudonymous, which were circulating in southern Italy. Thus, we find in the *5L* texts attributed to John of Constantinople,⁸⁷ Basil,⁸⁸ the desert fathers,⁸⁹ Jerome and Damasus,⁹⁰ and so forth.

Because the *5L* was regarded as a patristic florilegium, it attracted to itself further patristic texts. Thus, the Vatican manuscript of the *5L* has substantial sections of patristic florilegia, largely of a non-canonical nature, added before the collection.⁹¹ And Paola Supino Martini has recently suggested on palaeographical and codicological grounds that an additional quire with these patristic texts was made specifically to be added to the *5L* in that manuscript.⁹²

The *5L* was regarded also as a florilegium of liturgical texts, and in several instances liturgical canons which are only tangentially disciplinary were used within the collection.⁹³ As in the case of the patristic florilegia, so the *5L* attracted liturgical texts to itself. Thus, at the conclusion of the Vatican manuscript of the *5L* a penitential *ordo* and an excerpt from a sacramentary have been added⁹⁴ — again on folios made specifically to go with the rest of the manuscript.⁹⁵ Attached to the Casanatense codex of the *74 Titles* and excerpts from the *5L*, moreover, is the Mass exposition *Dominus vobiscum* attributed to Isidore or Alcuin.⁹⁶

That the *5L* was regarded in its own day as a rich patristic and liturgical florilegium is indicated by its use in the derivative collections. We have seen, for example, how canons from the *5L* were mixed with patristic texts and added to manuscripts such as those containing the *Collection in 74 Titles*.⁹⁷ Derivatives of the *5L* had various liturgical *ordines* added to them⁹⁸ or used liturgical texts from the *5L* itself to supplement such vast liturgical florilegia as the Farfese *Liber multiloquiorum*.⁹⁹

⁸⁷ See, e.g., *5L* 5.149 (Vat. lat. 1339, fol. 289v); 5.155.2 (Vat. lat. 1339, fol. 290v); 5.156 (Vat. lat. 1339, fol. 291r); 5.158 (Vat. lat. 1339, fol. 291r); and 5.160 (Vat. lat. 1339, fol. 291v).

⁸⁸ On which see Reynolds, 'Basil', 527.

⁸⁹ E.g., *5L* 3.272 (F, pp. 448 f.).

⁹⁰ See Reynolds, 'A South Italian Liturgico-Canonical Mass Commentary'.

⁹¹ fols. 1r-6v.

⁹² Supino Martini, *Roma*, p. 228.

⁹³ E.g., the pseudonymous correspondence between Damasus and Jerome and the accompanying Mass commentary as cited above in note 90.

⁹⁴ fols. 311r-317v, on which see *A Catalogue of Canon and Roman Law Manuscripts in the Vatican Library*, vol. I, p. 73.

⁹⁵ Supino Martini, *Roma*, p. 228.

⁹⁶ Roger E. Reynolds, 'Pseudonymous Liturgica in Early Medieval Canon Law Collections' in *Fälschungen im Mittelalter. Internationaler Kongress der Monumenta Germaniae Historica, München, 16.-19. September 1986. Teil II. Gefälschte Rechtstexte. Der bestrafte Fälscher* (MGH Schriften 33.2; Hanover, 1988), p. 71, note 37.

⁹⁷ See above, note 74.

⁹⁸ See above, notes 54 f.

⁹⁹ See above, note 77.

In recent important articles, Theo Kölzer suggested that canonical collections compiled before and during the period of the Gregorian reform should be examined for their monastic character;¹⁰⁰ and certainly this is appropriate for the *5L*, which in several senses may be considered a monastic collection. First, it has been shown that at least two of the extant manuscripts of the collection were produced in monasteries. These derivative collections compiled in monasteries suggest that there were other copies of the *5L*, now lost, that were monastic in origin. Simply because a collection was copied or kept in a monastic setting, however, does not *ipso facto* make it monastic. Rather, the contents must display at least a modicum of interest in specifically monastic questions. While not overwhelmingly monastically oriented, there are sections of the *5L* devoted to religious men and women,¹⁰¹ thereby suggesting that it could be intended to be used in a monastic setting. In recent literature a great deal has been made of the Ps.-Bonifatian (JE +1996) and Ps.-Gregorian (JE +1366, +1951) canons regarding the privileges of monks as demonstrating monastic dispositions of a collection or manuscript.¹⁰² Indeed, the Vallicelliana manuscript of the *5L* from Sant'Eutizio does contain the Ps.-Bonifatian canon.¹⁰³ Further, the derivative collections frequently have these canons.¹⁰⁴ Beyond these, one of the derivatives, the *Collection of Vallicelliana F 2*, contains a canon on the election of an abbot,¹⁰⁵ and the *Collectio Toletana* includes a canon originally directed to clerics but altered so as to pertain to monks.¹⁰⁶

There is a final characteristic of the *5L* which is clear in its preface and in the ways it was used in the derivative collections, but has perhaps been obscured by the edition of only the first three books by Fornasari. That is, the *5L* is highly penitential in nature. It was written, according to the preface, for the remedy of a

¹⁰⁰ Theo Kölzer, 'Die Farfenser Kanonessammlung des Cod. Vat. lat. 8487 (*Collectio Farfensis*)', *Bulletin of Medieval Canon Law* N.S. 7 (1977) 97; and 'Mönchtum und Kirchenrecht. Bemerkungen zu monastischen Kanonessammlungen der vorgratianischen Zeit', *Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte, kan. Abt.* 69 (1983) 121-42. Also see Giorgio Picasso, "Sacri canones et monastica regula" nella cultura del monachesimo subalpino (sec. XI) in *Dal Piemonte all'Europa: Esperienze monastiche nella società medievale (Relazioni e comunicazioni presentate al XXXIV Congresso storico subalpino, Torino, 27-29 maggio 1985)* (Turin, 1988), pp. 199-211.

¹⁰¹ E.g., 2.107-202; F, pp. 253-95.

¹⁰² E.g., Kölzer, *Collectio canonum*, p. 54; and John Gilchrist, 'The Influence of the Monastic Forgeries attributed to Pope Gregory I (JE +1951) and Boniface IV (JE +1996)' in *Fälschungen im Mittelalter*, pp. 263-87.

¹⁰³ fol. 162r-v.

¹⁰⁴ E.g., El Escorial, Real Biblioteca de San Lorenzo Z.III.19, fols. 10v-11r (JE + 1366), 111r-112r (JE + 1996); Monte Cassino, Archivio della Badia 216, pp. 173-178 (JE + 1366), 181-183 (JE + 1996); Rome, Biblioteca Casanatense 2010, fols. 187v-188v (JE + 1996); Rome, Biblioteca Vallicelliana F 92, fols. 192v-193v (JE + 1996).

¹⁰⁵ fol. 92r.

¹⁰⁶ Cap. 144; on which see Adamson, *Collectio Toletana*, p. 7.

diversity of sins,¹⁰⁷ and books 4 and 5 are heavily penitential in nature. Contemporaries quickly discovered this and drew heavily from these books, combining them often with the *Corrector* of Burchard.¹⁰⁸

* * *

In sum, our vade-mecum of south and central Italy in the eleventh century was many things to many people — to canonists, compilers of patristic florilegia, liturgists, monks, and confessors. Although full copies of the *5L* itself are rare, its importance and richness are reflected in its many and diverse derivatives.

Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies.

¹⁰⁷ This was stressed by Fournier ('Un groupe', 166).

¹⁰⁸ See above, notes 49 and 62.

THE GREEK LITURGY OF ST. JOHN CHRYSOSTOM IN BENEVENTAN SCRIPT: AN EARLY MANUSCRIPT FRAGMENT*

Roger E. Reynolds

THE influence of Greek liturgical culture in the areas where Beneventan script was written has long been known and well documented. For example, the renowned Barberini codex, Vatican, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana (hereafter BAV) Barb. gr. 336, written in Greek in the late eighth or early ninth century and bearing the earliest surviving text of the Liturgies of SS. Basil and John Chrysostom, has long taken pride of place among the scores of liturgical manuscripts from southern Italy.¹ Greek liturgical rolls written in southern Italy, although somewhat rare, are not uncommon,² and their influence on Latin liturgical *rotuli* of the region has often been stressed.³ The liturgy of the Roman rite, written in Greek in southern Italy, the so-called Liturgy of St. Peter, has been intensively analyzed;⁴ and there are multiple studies of the Latin translations by Leo Thuscus and Nicholas of Otranto of the so-called *Missa graecorum* in the late twelfth and early thirteenth centuries.⁵

* For permission to publish photographs of the fragment and for help in the preparation of this article I am grateful to the manuscript librarian of Bryn Mawr College, Pennsylvania, Leo Dolenski. Research for this article on 'monumenta liturgica beneventana' was done with the help of a grant from the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada.

¹ On this codex and its origin, see Anselm Strittmatter, 'The "Barberinum s. Marci" of Jacques Goar', *Ephemerides Liturgicae* 47 (1933) 329-67; André Jacob, 'L'evoluzione dei libri liturgici bizantini in Calabria e in Sicilia dall'VIII al XVI secolo, con particolare riguardo ai riti eucaristici in Calabria Bizantina. Vita religiosa e strutture amministrative (*Atti del primo e secondo incontro di Studi Bizantini*) (Reggio Calabria, 1974), p. 51; and A. Jacob, 'La tradition manuscrite de la liturgie de Saint Jean Chrysostome (VIII-XII siècles)' in *Eucharisties d'Orient et d'Occident*, 2 vols. (Lex Orandi 46-47; Paris, 1970), 2.109-138.

² See, e.g., André Grabar, *Les manuscrits grecs enluminés de provenance italienne (IX^e-XI^e siècles)* (Paris, 1972), p. 47.

³ See, e.g., Gerhard B. Ladner, 'The "Portraits" of Emperors in Southern Italian *Exultet* Rolls and the Liturgical Commemoration of the Emperor', *Speculum* 17 (1942) 181-200; and Guglielmo Cavallo, *Rotoli di Exultet dell'Italia meridionale* (Bari, 1973), pp. 32-35.

⁴ See the bibliography on this in Roger E. Reynolds, 'St. Peter, Liturgy of' in *Dictionary of the Middle Ages*, ed. Joseph R. Strayer, 12 vols. (New York, 1988), 10.620-21; to which may be added Klaus Gamber, 'Die griechisch-lateinischen Mess-libelli in Süditalien' in *La chiesa greca in Italia dall'VIII al XVI secolo: Atti del Convegno storico interecclesiale* (Bari, 30 apr.- 4 magg. 1969), 3 vols. (Padua, 1973), 3.1299-1306.

⁵ Anselm Strittmatter, "Missa Graecorum", "Missa Sancti Iohannis Crisostomi". The Oldest

In his recent important study of the Old Beneventan chant Thomas Forrest Kelly has noted numerous instances in which Greek liturgical practice was used in the area where Beneventan script was written, and he has demonstrated that elements of the Greek liturgy were taken into the liturgical rite celebrated in Benevento itself. In some instances the Greek text was transliterated into Latin characters to be used on several of the most significant feasts in the liturgical rite there.⁶ The present article draws attention to another extraordinary Greek liturgical text transliterated into Latin characters with rubrics in Latin, both written in Beneventan script of the late tenth or early eleventh centuries.

The fragment with this Greek liturgical text is now in the manuscript collection of the Bryn Mawr College Library and bears the provisional shelfmark Goodhart Collection, Fragment 2. It was the third fragment in a bound collection of fragments of Greek manuscripts given to the library by Howard Lehman Goodhart in 1943. The fragment came to the attention of John Mitchell of the University of East Anglia, who generously notified Virginia Brown of its existence.

The fragment of text is written on a single piece of somewhat brittle and rough vellum measuring about 203 x 137 mm. For the lines, crude prick marks of both holes and slits are visible on the right-hand margin. The folio was originally ruled on the flesh side with a stylus, which has left a yellowish stain. There are twenty horizontal lines ruled about 8 mm. apart, and these are run through by vertical lines to form margins enclosing a horizontal writing space of about 108 mm.

The writing on the folio does not follow the original rulings. Instead the folio was folded to make a bifolium, and text was entered on only one side (now unnumbered fol. 1r-v) at right angles to the original ruling.

The script is in a black ink with red/orange rubrics. Although in some places of the Greek transliterated text on fol. 1r, the script appears to be in a pale brown ink that has been gone over with a stronger black ink, the black has in fact been rubbed off.

After the text was completed the bifolium was bound, presumably with other bifolia containing texts before and after it. There are three sets of binding holes: the lowest set, 7 mm., is 11 mm. from the bottom of the bifolium; the middle set, 3.5 mm., is 67 mm. from the bottom of the bifolium; and the top set is now lost owing to tearing of the upper centre of the bifolium, caused presumably by wear or when the bifolium was torn from attached bifolia.

It would seem that the surviving bifolium was part of the last quire of a *libellus* with two or more quires attached because its text falls late in the liturgical rite it

Latin Version Known of the Byzantine Liturgies of St. Basil and St. John Chrysostom', *Traditio* 1 (1943) 79-137. On the notion and misuse of the term *Missa greca*, see Bernice M. Kaczynski, *Greek in the Carolingian Age: The St. Gall Manuscripts* (Cambridge, Mass., 1988), p. 102.

⁶ Thomas Forrest Kelly, *The Beneventan Chant* (Cambridge, 1989), pp. 203-218.

represents. Thus, quires before our bifolium would have contained the first and largest part of the liturgical rite, and a bifolium or bifolia bound into our bifolium after fol. 1v would have contained the remainder of the liturgical rite. The blank parts of our bifolium, fol. 2r-v, would have been the outside cover of the last quire of the liturgical *libellus*.

With the exception of the rubric 'PHON' (a shortened form of Ekphonos?), a Greek *zeta* and what resemble the Greek *mu*'s, the writing is entirely in Latin characters. The text written in black ink is the transliterated form of the end of the precommunion and beginning of the communion of the Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom. Further, with the exception of the words 'Proschome', which is rubricated, and 'Ta agia tis agiis,' on fol. 1v, this Greek transliterated text is in an uncalledigraphic Beneventan hand. These words and the rubrics for the text in Latin on fol. 1r-v are written in a calligraphic Beneventan hand. It is always risky to date a text on the basis of the few letters in our fragment, but its open character, the lack of a descender on the final *r*, and the *n* and *m* with feet rather than lozenges suggest that the text was written in the late tenth or early eleventh centuries.⁷ It is not in Bari-type Beneventan script⁸ and therefore was written probably not in Puglia but somewhere else in the lower or central part of southern Italy.⁹

In the examples of transliterated Greek text in Professor Kelly's study, the writing in the manuscripts is in a sure Beneventan hand, probably signifying that there was a long tradition of copying such transliterated texts. In our fragment, however, there appear to be two distinct methods of writing, the calligraphic and uncalledigraphic types. The former is used for the Latin and a few Greek words on fol. 1v. That one scribe was responsible for both this writing and the uncalledigraphic sections of the transliterated Greek text is likely if the forms of such letters as *a*, *c*, *e*, and *r* are compared. Why the scribe would have used these two types is unclear. It is possible that the scribe was generally accustomed to writing in Latin, and when called upon to transliterate from a Greek text he became unsure and switched into the uncalledigraphic style. For example, at times his *m*'s are in proper Beneventan script; at other times they resemble a Greek *mu*. But if the scribe were uncertain when he came to Greek text, why did he write on fol. 1v in the

⁷ See E. A. Loew, *The Beneventan Script. A History of the South Italian Minuscule*, 2nd enlarged edition prepared by Virginia Brown, 2 vols. (Sussidi eruditi 33-34; Rome, 1980), 1.137 and plates I and II.

⁸ On the relation between Greek and Beneventan scripts in Puglia see Alessandro Pratesi, 'Influenza della scrittura greca nella formazione della beneventana del tipo di Bari' in *La chiesa greca* 3.1095-1109.

⁹ There are now indications that Beneventan script was written in Basilicata (see Virginia Brown, 'A New Commentary on Matthew in Beneventan Script at Venosa', *Mediaeval Studies* 49 [1987] 443-65), but there is no substantial evidence that it was written in Calabria, although it is most likely that it was. It is, of course, possible that our scribe was a traveller who wrote in Beneventan script at some place distant from southern Italy.

uncalligraphic script the *nomina sacra* 'Isu xps', which he would certainly have known from Latin? Perhaps, the uncalligraphic script is an attempt to imitate the Greek script of his exemplar, but one cannot be certain of this. In any event, all of this suggests that the scribe was not copying from a previously transliterated text but was writing *de novo* from 1) a text in Greek, 2) one he knew by heart, or 3) one being dictated to him.

Which was it? There are indications of all three. For a written copy made by a scribe who was acquainted with Greek are the *phon*, *zeta*, accents (sometimes misused), and the *m*'s that in some instances resemble the Greek *mu*. On the other hand, the orthography of the Greek transliterated text may indicate an oral or memory source. Why, for example, would our scribe, if following a written Greek source, change a Greek *kappa* to a Latin *c* in some places but maintain it in others? Moreover, the sign 7 is used for a Greek accent, for an *iota*, and for *uio*, *ei*, and *h*. One indication that our scribe was transliterating from a text he knew by heart in Greek but may have had before him a written source or a dictated source appears in the last word of fol. 1r. The scribe originally wrote *apu* and then over this wrote *el*. The former word comes from one text of the Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom represented in variant manuscripts printed in the classic text by Goar¹⁰ and in such manuscripts as the famous twelfth-century Rossano codex, Vatican, BAV Vat. gr. 1970,¹¹ but not in the renowned Barberini text of about 800. The text subsequent to the word *apu* emended to *el*, however, is from the Barberini text. That is, the scribe recognized the appropriate form found in the Barberini text, but began unthinkingly to write the later variant, probably from memory. In short, the scribe knew both Greek and Latin. He may have been transliterating from a Greek text — hence the uncalligraphic form of the transliteration — but he also was transliterating from what appears to have been dictation or memory.¹² That such might happen in the early Middle Ages has been brilliantly demonstrated by Ann Freeman, who has shown that in the composition of the *Libri Carolini*, Theodulf of Orléans used common Latin Psalter texts but the memory of his native Visigothic liturgical use intruded into the writing of the biblical text.¹³

Because our text appears on such a poor piece of parchment, it might be thought that it is a *probatio pennae*. This is unlikely, however, because of the utilitarian

¹⁰ On the manuscripts used by Goar, see Strittmatter, "The "Barberinum s. Marci" of Jacques Goar", 330 f.

¹¹ On this manuscript see Giovanni Mercati, 'L'Eucologio di S. Maria del Patire con un frammento di Anafora greca inedita', *Revue bénédictine* 46 (1934) 224-40; and Jacob, 'La tradition manuscrite de la liturgie de Saint Jean Chrysostome (viii^e-xii^e siècles)', 127.

¹² On this phenomenon see Jacob, 'La tradition manuscrite de la liturgie de Saint Jean Chrysostome (viii^e-xii^e siècles)', 111.

¹³ See Ann Freeman, 'Theodulf of Orléans and the Psalm Citations of the "Libri Carolini"', *Revue bénédictine* 97 (1987) 195-224.

rubrics and because it begins and ends in mid sentences. Thus, it seems to have been part of a more extensive text of the Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom. Our scribe, knowing both Latin and Greek, was thus probably writing the text for a Latin-speaking priest who could not read Greek characters but who had to serve a Greek-speaking community using the Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom. That a Latin-speaking priest might offer the Eucharist according to the Greek rite rather than the Roman or Beneventan might seem extraordinary, until it is remembered that in southern Italy there were frequent liturgical interchanges by Greek and Latin communities,¹⁴ and that prior to the Schism of 1054 between the Greek and Latin churches this probably would not have been considered unusual or uncannonical in southern Italy.

The poor quality of the bifolium and its writing suggest that the *libellus* to which it belonged was not made for deluxe or continuous usage such as other extant grand Greek manuscripts and *rotuli* of the Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom¹⁵ or the imposing Latin manuscripts from Benevento with their transliterated Greek elements.¹⁶ We know, for example, of occasional services at Monte Cassino on a portable altar being celebrated in Latin and Greek in the tower of St. Benedict¹⁷ and if it were a Greek Mass, there might simply have been a Greek translation of the Latin rite such as is found in later manuscripts.¹⁸ But it is not beyond the realm of possibility that at Monte Cassino and elsewhere the Greek liturgy celebrated in these occasional joint services might have been that of St. John Chrysostom and that an unprepossessing *libellus* such as ours might have been used.

Beyond its importance in showing the liturgical interplay between Latins and Greeks in southern Italy, our text is extraordinary for the development of the Greek liturgy itself. As has been noted, the oldest texts of the Liturgies of SS. Basil and John Chrysostom appear in the eighth- or ninth-century Barberini codex in Greek described by Cardinal Pitra: 'Le plus ancien et le plus beau des nos manuscrits liturgiques assurément l'inestimable *Euchologe* du viii^e siècle, que les princes Barberini ont heureusement conservé dans leur riche bibliothèque.'¹⁹ There are then few witness of these liturgies until the thirteenth century,²⁰ and hence, our

¹⁴ Kelly, *Beneventan Chant*, p. 204.

¹⁵ E.g., see above note 2.

¹⁶ Kelly, *Beneventan Chant*, pp. 206-217.

¹⁷ *ibid.*, 205.

¹⁸ See Strittmatter, "Missa Grecorum", "Missa Sancti Iohannis Crisostomi", 79-137.

¹⁹ Jean B. Pitra, *Hymnographie de l'Eglise grecque* (Rome, 1867), p. 56.

²⁰ Jacob, 'La tradition manuscrite de la liturgie de Saint Jean Chrysostome (viii^e-xii^e siècles)' lists the following manuscripts of the Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom from c. A.D. 800 to the thirteenth century. The Italo-Greek type are: Vatican, BAV Barb. gr. 336 (s. viii/ix); Leningrad, Gosudarstvennaia publichnaia biblioteka imeni M. E. Saltykova-Shchedrina gr. 226 (the *Euchologion* of Porphyre Uspenskij) (s. x); Grottaferrata, Biblioteca della Badia F. β. VII (s. x); F. β. IV (s. x2/2) Z. δ. II

fragment from the late tenth or early eleventh centuries is precious indeed. If the text is compared with the Liturgies of SS. Basil and John Chrysostom in the Barberini codex,²¹ most of it could, in fact, have derived from either, but the first few words on fol. 1r are found only in the Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom.²²

Our text is further significant in that it reflects the Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom in transition in southern Italy from what André Jacob calls the Italo-Greek or Calabrese tradition to the Constantinopolitan tradition.²³ The text largely follows the Italo-Greek or Calabrese form, but in several cases variants from later Constantinopolitan witnesses to the Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom appear. The emended 'apu' at the bottom of fol. 1v is an instance of this,²⁴ as is the 'Enite to ko' at the bottom of fol. 1v, which appears in variant manuscripts reported by Goar.²⁵ Also it is interesting that the prayer 'khari tu...' concludes in the tradition of the Liturgy of the Presanctified found both in the Barberini manuscript²⁶ and in the eleventh-century Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom,²⁷ but not in the Barberini text of the Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom.²⁸

The transliterated text of our fragment is printed below in the left-hand column. The orthography of the fragment is maintained, and Latin abbreviations such as 'Sec sacer' and 'Can com' are kept because their expansion into 'Secreto sacerdos' or 'Cantus communionis' is uncertain. Also the sign 7 has been maintained because it was used to transliterate a variety of accents, diphthongs, and letters. In the right-hand column below, the Greek text of the Barberini codex is printed as it is found in Swainson's edition (B), with variants in our fragment as reported in 1) the Liturgy of the Presanctified (P) from that same codex, 2) the eleventh-century Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom (E), 3) the Codex Rossanensis (R), and 4) the communion chant (Ps 148:1).

(1090). The Constantinopolitan type are: Moscow, Gosudarstvennaia biblioteka SSSR imeni V. I. Lenina gr. 27 (s. x); Mt. Sinai, St. Catherine's Monastery gr. 958, 959 (s. xi); 961, 962 (s. xi-xii); 1036 (s. xii-xiii); Vatican, BAV gr. 1970 (the Rossano codex) (s. xii); and Jerusalem, Patriarchal Library, Stavrou 109 (*rotulus* of s. x).

²¹ For these texts see F. E. Brightman, *Liturgies Eastern and Western Being the Texts Original or Translated of the Principal Liturgies of the Church*, vol. 1: *Eastern Liturgies* (Oxford, 1896), pp. 340 f.

²² *ibid.*

²³ Jacob, 'L'evoluzione dei libri liturgici bizantini in Calabria e in Sicilia', 61, and 49, where he notes that in the Calabrese *Euchologion* there are parts noted for other participants beyond the *sacerdos* (as is the case in our fragment), while in the Constantinopolitan *Euchologion* the parts are for the *sacerdos* alone.

²⁴ See above, p. 299.

²⁵ Jacobus Goar, *Euchologion sive Rituale Graecorum* (Venice, 1730), pp. 65, 76.

²⁶ C. A. Swainson, *The Greek Liturgies Chiefly from Original Authorities* (Cambridge, 1884), p. 97.

²⁷ *ibid.*, 136.

²⁸ *ibid.*, 93.

BRYN MAWR FRAGMENT

<recto>

<i>atros ton psicho<n>
imon ke to somato<n>.

Φov sacer: khari tu ku
ke hictirmis ke 7 filan-
thropian tu monoge-
nu su 7u meth u eblogi-
tos 7 sin to panagio
ke agatho ke zoopio
su pneumatī nin ke
a7 ke is tus eonas ton
eonon. *Sec sacer:*

Prosche kyrie Ihesu Christe
O theos imon ex agiu-
catik7tiriū ke el- <eras. apu>

<verso>

<th>e is to agiase imas
< > ano to patri sincathi-
menos, ke ode imin ao-
ratos sinon, ke cata-
xioson ti cratea su
chiri, metadune imin
ke di imon panti to
lau su. *Leva<t> ipsa munera
ad celos et dicat diaconus:*

Proschome. Et sacer:

Ta agia tis agiis. *Populus:*

Is agios is kurios Ihesu Christus

doxan theu patros. Amin.

Can com: Enite to ko

GREEK TEXT

 ἰατρὸς τῶν ψυχῶν
καὶ τῶν σωμάτων ἡμῶν
χάριτι <τοῦ κυρίου>
καὶ οἰκτιρμοῖς καὶ φιλαν-
θρωπία τοῦ. <P> μονογε-
νοῦς σου Υἱοῦ, μεθ' οὗ εὐλογη-
τὸς εἶ σὺν τῷ παναγίῳ
καὶ ἀγαθῷ καὶ ζωοποιῷ
<σου> Πνεύματι, νῦν <E> καὶ
ἀεὶ, καὶ εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν
αἰώνων.

 Πρόσχες, Κύριε Ἰησοῦ Χριστέ,
ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν, ἐξ ἀγίου
κατοικητηρίου σου καὶ ἐλ-
<R ἀπὸ θρόνου τῆς...>

 θεὲ εἰς τὸ ἀγιάσαι ἡμᾶς,
ὁ ἄνω τῷ Πατρὶ συγκαθεζό-
μενος καὶ ὧδε ἡμῖν ἀό-
ρατος συνών κατα-
ξίωσον τῇ κραταίᾳ σου
χειρὶ μεταδοῦναι ἡμῖν
καὶ δι' ἡμῶν παντὶ τῷ
λαῷ σου.

Πρόσχωμεν.

Τὰ ἄγια τοῖς ἀγίοις.

Εἷς ἅγιος, εἷς Κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χρισ-
τός, εἷς

δόξαν Θεοῦ Πατρός. <' Ἀμήν>

<Ps 148:1> Αἰνεῖτε τὸν κύριον



PUBLICATIONS OF THE PONTIFICAL INSTITUTE OF MEDIAEVAL STUDIES

ISBN Prefix: 0-88844-

Series Codes

EGS	The Etienne Gilson Series	PMS	Papers in Mediaeval Studies
GIPS	The Greek Index Project Series	SM	Subsidia Mediaevalia
MST	Mediaeval Sources in Translation	ST	Studies and Texts
PDOE	Publications of the Dictionary of Old English	MLT	Toronto Medieval Latin Texts

Recent New Publications

Aging and the Aged in Medieval Europe. Edited by Michael M. Sheehan. PMS 11. 1990; xii, 228 pp. ISBN -811-2. \$26.00

A collection of 14 papers on how the Middle Ages dealt with a significant aspect of all societies.

Campbell, Sheila. The Mosaics of Antioch. The Corpus of Mosaic Pavements in Turkey. SM 15. 1988; xviii, 239 pp., 28 figures, 234 plates. ISBN -364-1. \$41.00

A detailed catalogue with new up-to-date information on the technical and artistic aspects of the mosaics of ancient Antioch.

Chatton, Walter. Reportatio et lectura super Sententias: Collatio ad librum primum et prologus. Edited by Joseph C. Wey. ST 90. 1989; viii, 424 pp. ISBN -090-1. \$43.00

Chatton was a major fourteenth-century critic of Ockham. This is the beginning of his important commentary on the *Sentences*.

Eiximenis, Francesc. Psalterium alias Laudatorium Papae Benedicto XIII dedicatum. Edited by Curt J. Wittlin. ST 87. 1988; viii, 327 pp. ISBN -087-1. \$39.00

A collection of 350 prayers and contemplations in refined Latin, grouped in three coherent thematic cycles.

Gervers, Michael and Ramzi J. Bikhazi, ed. Conversion and Continuity. Indigenous Christian Communities in Islamic Lands, Eighth to Eighteenth Centuries. PMS 9. 1990; xvi, 559 pp. ISBN -809-0. \$49.50

26 essays concerning all aspects of conversion from both the Christian and Muslim points of view.

Jeffrey, David L. and Brian J. Levy, ed. The Anglo-Norman Lyric. An Anthology. Edited from the manuscripts with translations and commentary. ST 93. 1990; xiv, 285 pp. ISBN -093-6. \$31.50

Fifty-two texts and translations, encompassing devotional lyrics, homiletical verse, social and domestic commentary, and celebrations of love and friendship.

Lee, Harold, Marjorie Reeves, Giulio Silano. Western Mediterranean Prophecy. The School of Joachim of Fiore and the Fourteenth-Century Breviloquium. ST 88. 1989; viii, 346 pp. ISBN -088-X. \$38.00

A study of Joachimite thought in the fourteenth century, and a critical edition of an important summary of the Joachimite vision of the world and of society.

PUBLICATIONS

- Maurer, Armand. Being and Knowing. Studies in Thomas Aquinas and Later Medieval Philosophers.** PMS 10. 1990; x, 496 pp. ISBN -810-4. \$65.00
A collection of 23 revised essays concerning the ideas of Western European philosophers living between roughly 1250 and 1350.
- McCready, William D. Signs of Sanctity. Miracles in the Thought of Gregory the Great.** ST 91. 1989; xiv, 316 pp. ISBN -091-X. \$32.00
This detailed reading, especially of the *Dialogues*, attempts to discover whether Gregory really believed the miracle stories he relates.
- Merriell, D. Juvenal. To the Image of the Trinity. A Study in the Development of Aquinas' Teaching.** ST 96. 1990; x, 266 pp. ISBN -096-0. \$29.50
Aquinas' doctrine of the image of the Trinity and its relationship to Augustine's teaching.
- Palamas, Gregory. The One Hundred and Fifty Chapters.** Edited and translated by Robert E. Sinkewicz. ST 83. 1988; xii, 288 pp.; 325 pp. on 1 fiche. ISBN -083-9. \$39.00
A critical edition and English translation of Palamas' reflections on the larger doctrinal context of the fourteenth-century theological debates. A 325-page concordance to the Greek text is on microfiche.
- Raftis, J. Ambrose. Early Tudor Godmanchester. Survivals and New Arrivals.** ST 97. 1990; xiv, 466 pp. ISBN -097-9. \$63.00
An abundance of surviving records allows an in-depth picture of a town adapting to the social and economic changes of the late Middle Ages.
- The Religious Roles on the Papacy: Ideals and Realities, 1150-1300.** Edited by Christopher Ryan. PMS 8. 1989; xii, 476 pp., plates. ISBN -808-2. \$55.00
Fifteen studies exploring important aspects of the papacy during a particularly formative period of its history.
- Sawa, George Dimitri. Music Performance Practice in the Early 'Abbāsid Era, 132-320 AH / 750-932 AD.** ST 92. 1989; xviii, 251 pp. ISBN -092-8. \$29.50
An examination of the theory and practice of musical performance in the medieval Middle East, concentrating on al-Fārābī and al-Isbahānī.
- Silano, Giulio. Acts of Gubertinus de Nouate, Notary of the Patriarch of Aquileia, 1328-1336.** A calendar with selected documents. ST 102. 1990; xiv, 357 pp. ISBN -102-9. \$52.00
A study of the early registers of a Lombard notary who drafted acts for the episcopal ruler of the largest diocese in Europe.
- Simonsohn, Shlomo. The Apostolic See and the Jews.**
Documents: 492-1404. ST 94. 1988; xiv, 550 pp. ISBN -094-4. \$49.00
Documents: 1394-1464. ST 95. 1989; vi, 594 pp. ISBN -095-2. \$49.00
Documents: 1464-1521. ST 99. 1990; vi, 492 pp. ISBN -099-5. \$49.00
An edition with explanatory notes of 1295 papal documents dealing with the Jews (Gelasius I to Leo X).
- Sinkewicz, Robert E. Project Description and Development Strategy.** GIPS 1. 1989; 23 pp. \$ 4.00
A detailed description of the organization, methodology and future of this information access system for Greek manuscripts containing works written prior to 1600 AD.
- Sinkewicz, Robert E., and Walter M. Hayes. Manuscript Listings for the Authored Works of the Palaeologan Period.** GIPS 2. 1989; 17 pp., 3 fiche. \$ 6.00
A detailed list (664 pages) of manuscripts from works of known authors of the Palaeologan and early post-Byzantine periods.

PUBLICATIONS

- Stork, Nancy Porter. **Through a Gloss Darkly. Aldhelm's Riddles in the British Library MS Royal 12.C.xxiii.** ST 98. 1990; viii, 274 pp. ISBN -098-7. \$39.50
This diplomatic edition of the full set of scholia (or glosses) to Aldhelm's *Enigmata*, a popular medieval school text, includes a discussion of surviving manuscripts, a taxonomy of the glosses, and translations of each riddle.
- Thierry of Chartres. **The Latin Rhetorical Commentaries.** Edited by Karin M. Fredborg. ST 84. 1988; vi, 403 pp. ISBN -084-7. \$39.50
Thierry's commentaries on Cicero's manual on rhetorical argumentation, the *De inventione*, and the Pseudo-Ciceronian *Rhetorica ad Herennium*.
- Two Greek Aristotelian Commentators on the Intellect. The *De Intellectu* attributed to Alexander of Aphrodisias, and Themistius' Paraphrase of Aristotle *De Anima* 3.4-8. Introduction, translation, commentary by Frederic M. Schroeder and Robert B. Todd. MST 33. 1990; xiv, 165 pp. ISBN -283-1. \$10.00
The nature and influence of the Aristotelian doctrine of the active intellect in 2 commentaries influential in the Middle Ages and Renaissance.
- Walsh, Maura, and Dáibhí Ó Cróinín, eds. **Cummian's Letter *De controversia paschali* and the *De ratione computandi*.** ST 86. 1988; x, 264 pp. ISBN -086-3. \$31.00
A new edition of Cumman's letter on the Paschal controversy, and a critical edition of a computational manual composed in Ireland at about the same time.
- Wernham, Monique. **La communauté juive de Salon-de-Provence d'après les actes notariés 1391-1435.** ST 82. 1988; xviii, 303 pp., maps. ISBN -082-0. \$35.00
A study of a Jewish community in southern France based on a rich collection of legal and administrative documents.
- Williams, Caroline. **Anemurium: The Roman and Early Byzantine Pottery.** SM 16. 1989; xvi, 197 pp., 606 figures, 24 plates. ISBN -365-X. \$39.50
A detailed catalogue based on 14 years of systematic excavations of this small provincial city in Asia Minor.
- Wright, Stephen K. **The Vengeance of Our Lord: Medieval Dramatizations of the Destruction of Jerusalem.** ST 89. 1989; x, 233 pp., 3 fiche. ISBN -089-8. \$29.00
A critical history of the large family of medieval plays depicting the siege and destruction of Jerusalem in 70 AD. Included on microfiche are editions of 6 plays.
- Zacour, Norman. **Jews and Saracens in the Consilia of Oldradus de Ponte.** ST 100. 1990; x, 114 pp. ISBN -100-2. \$18.00
Many of Oldradus' legal arguments at Avignon concerned the problems posed by the presence of Muslims and Jews in Christian territories.

MEDIAEVAL STUDIES

An annual journal of scholarship on the Middle Ages

Volumes 1-50 (1939-1988)	per volume	\$ 30.00
Volumes 1-50 (1939-1988)	set	\$700.00
Volume 51 (1989)		\$ 45.00
Volume 52 (1990)		\$ 45.00
General Index, volumes 1-25 (1939-1963). ISBN -625-X.		\$ 11.00
First Supplement Index, volumes 26-30 (1964-1968). ISBN -631-4.		\$ 3.00
Second Supplement Index, volumes 31-40 (1969-1978). ISBN -684-9.		\$ 12.00

All correspondence regarding articles should be addressed to:

The Executive Editor
Mediaeval Studies
59 Queen's Park Crescent East
Toronto, Ontario
Canada M5S 2C4

Electronic Mail:
PONTIFEX@VM.EPAS.UTORONTO.CA
(BITNET)

Mediaeval Studies does not accept books for review.

All correspondence regarding orders and subscriptions should be addressed to:

Ron B. THOMSON, D. Phil.
Director of Publications
59 Queen's Park Crescent East
Toronto, Ontario
Canada M5S 2C4

Electronic Mail:
PONTIFEX@VM.EPAS.UTORONTO.CA
(BITNET)

Subscription \$45.00 yearly. All back issues are still available.